
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 00296439 3

Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. XI.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME II.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

(VINAYA-PITAKA)

VOL. II.

(SUTTAVIBHAṄGA)

TRANSLATED BY

I. B. HORNER, M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSOCIATE OF NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

London

PUBLISHED FOR THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY

by

LUZAC & COMPANY LTD.

46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

1957

First published 1940
By The Oxford University Press
Reprinted 1957

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
LOWE AND BRYDONE (PRINTERS) LIMITED, LONDON, N.W.10

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

THIS volume of the *Book of the Discipline* covers Oldenberg's edition of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, vol. iii, p. 195, to vol. iv, p. 124, and thus comprises the thirty Nissaggiya rules and sixty of the ninety-two Pācittiya rules laid down for monks.

The actual rules, *sikkhāpada*, of the Pali Pātimokkha are accessible to English readers in Rhys Davids and Oldenberg's translation,[1] and translations even earlier.[2] They have also all been set out in full by B. C. Law,[3] while E. J. Thomas[4] has given some in their entirety and has summarised others, classifying these, under their appropriate sections, where affinities are visible. This is the first translation into English of these *sikkhāpadas* complete with their attendant material.

It has been truly and helpfully observed by the editors of *Vinaya Texts*[5] that " inside each class (of offence) the sequence of the clauses[6] follows no invariable rule. Sometimes offences of a related character are placed together in groups, but sometimes those which would naturally come together are found scattered in quite different parts of the same class." In addition, as Oldenberg has pointed out,[7] " it not infrequently happens that a rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."

A considerable amount of work having been done on the Pātimokkha, it will be better in this Introduction

---

[1] *Vin. Texts* i. 1 ff., *S.B.E.* XIII.
[2] Dickson, *J.R.A.S.* 1876; Gogerly, *J.R.A.S.* 1862; R. Spence Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, 1850, in various chapters.
[3] *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 50 ff., based on *Vin. Texts* i. 1 ff.
[4] *Hist. Bud. Thought*, 16 ff. [5] *Vin. Texts* i. xiv.
[6] *I.e.*, rule, ordinance, *sutta*, *dhamma*, clause or article.
[7] *Vinayapiṭaka*, i. xvii.

not to enlarge upon rules, grouping of rules or sporadic appearance of rules, but to confine myself mainly to various findings arising from a study of the auxiliary material—stories, Old Commentary and *anāpatti* (no offence) clauses—surrounding each rule.

Some of these Pātimokkha rules, when read in conjunction with their attendant material, testify that, although the legal decree and the penalty for its infringement may be the culminating point, there was also a softening influence at work. For the not altogether infrequent *anujānāmi* ("I allow") allowances, always put into the mouth of Gotama, tend to counteract any too great stringency, inexpediency or lack of clarity on the side of which the *sikkhāpada*, as first framed, may have erred.

Doubtless the *sikkhāpadas*, if isolated from their surrounding matter and viewed either as extracts from this or as the foundations on which it was later reared,[1] may be said to amount to not much more than a series of prohibitions. But on those occasions when an *anujānāmi* is present in the auxiliary material, then *anujānāmi* and *sikkhāpada*, allowance and rule, taken in association as they are intended to be, produce a balance, a middle way between the two extremes of uncompromising legal ordinance and unchecked laxity of behaviour. On such occasions the *anujānāmi* pulls against the rule, and appears as an event potent in its effect on the character of the rule, no less than on the history of its formulation.

The Nissaggiyas and Pācittiyas are arranged on the same general plan that the Suttavibhaṅga follows throughout. This comprises a story leading up to the formulation of a rule, *sikkhāpada*, which is laid down together with the penalty for breaking it. In some cases there follow one or more other stories showing that it was advisable to remodel the rule, and at whose conclusion the amended version of the rule is given. Next comes the Old Commentary or Padabhājaniya,

[1] *B.D.* i. xiv f.

defining the words of the rule; then cases where the penalty for breaking the rule or some lighter (never heavier) penalty is incurred; and finally, a list of cases which entail no offence against the rule.

THE NISSAGGIYA GROUP

Each of the thirty Nissaggiya rules for monks has, as the penalty for breaking it, expiation of the offence, *pācittiya*, involving forfeiture, *nissaggiya*. This penalty is stated in the words *nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ*, "(an offence) involving forfeiture, to be expiated." The forfeiture enjoined is that in respect of which the offence had been committed, for example a robe or bowl or rug. These rules are concerned both with behaviour as such and with the wrongful acquisition or unsuitable usage of things.

The form of expiation enjoined by the Old Commentary is confession[1] of the offence of wrongful acquisition. From internal evidence, *pācittiya* is a (minor) offence to be confessed, *āpatti desetabbā*, a statement common to all the Nissaggiyas. But etymologically the word *pācittiya* has nothing to do with confession. I have therefore kept to the more literal translation,[2] and have rendered it "offence of expiation" throughout, and the two words *nissaggiya pācittiya* as "offence of expiation involving forfeiture." According to the Old Commentary, "having forfeited (the article), the offence should be confessed." Thus the act of forfeiture should precede the expiation or confession. I will say something more below about the method in which forfeiture should be made.[3]

In history, the place *at which* an event is said to have taken place is often of some importance. It is well known that Gotama spent the greater part of his teaching life at Sāvatthī and his last years at Vesālī. It is worth recalling, for the evidence contributed, that Sāvatthī,

---

[1] *Cf.* S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, p. 104 ff.

[2] See below, p. 3, n. 4.

[3] Below, p. xii.

with an overwhelming majority, is given as the locus of twenty-two Nissaggiyas, Rājagaha of three, Vesālī and Kapilavatthu each of two, Āḷavī of one.

As many as sixteen Nissaggiya rules for monks are concerned with robes, and fall into two groups, Nos. I-X, XXIV-XXIX; five with rugs (*santhata*), Nos. XI-XV; two with sheep's wool, Nos. XVI, XVII; three with gold and silver and bartering, Nos. XVIII-XX; two with bowls, Nos. XXI, XXII; one with medicine, No. XXIII; and the last one, No. XXX, is against a monk appropriating for his own use benefits intended for the Order. There are, moreover, a few cross-sections. For example, in the matter of exchange of robes (No. V), in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating robes (No. IV), and in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating sheep's wool (No. XVII), the correct behaviour for a monk to observe towards a nun also comes under legislation; and in two of the rules connected with making rugs, sheep's wool is also the subject of legal attention.

Oddly, there is no Nissaggiya concerned with either lodgings or bedding, *senâsana*, or with almsfood, *piṇḍapāta*, which with robes and medicine are regarded as a monk's four indispensable requisites. There are offences regarding these which had to be confessed, and which occur in the Pācittiya section of the Pātimokkha, but evidently there are no types of offences where lodgings and almsfood had to be forfeited, in addition to their wrongful acquisition or usage being confessed.

About half the rules were formulated because the monks acquired something by means considered unbecoming, tiresome or inconvenient: they asked for too much, they pressed potential donors, for example as to the quality of the robe-material they particularly desired. The remaining half were formulated because monks did various things or used various articles in ways thought unsuitable: they had an unnecessary amount of robes or bowls, they laid aside their robes for too long, they made nuns wash their robes or their sheep's wool for them, and they carried sheep's wool so far that the laity made fun of them.

The formulation of the majority, namely of sixteen Nissaggiya rules, resulted, so it is recorded, from criticisms made of a monk or monks by the laity; eight from criticisms made by modest monks, three from those made by nuns, two from those made by Ānanda, and one from those made by a wanderer. With the exception of Ānanda, who complained for the sake of the Order, and not because he himself had been specially inconvenienced, these various classes of critics put forward their complaints because they personally had been in some way adversely affected by the monks' behaviour. Thus there is a parallelism between the sources of criticism and the sections of society annoyed. Once Gotama is recorded to have heard of troublesome behaviour direct from Mahāpajāpatī while he was talking to her (No. XVII), and once he came upon signs of it himself (No. XV). Four times a new rule is framed in place of one already existing, for occasions afterwards arose which showed that its scrupulous observance resulted in unfair situations.

It will be seen that the number of Nissaggiya rules formulated according to this reckoning is thirty-six. This means that six times the rule as originally framed had to be altered: four times, as mentioned above, in accordance with circumstances that had not been foreseen when it was first set forth (Nos. I, II, XIV, XXI), and twice when close adherence to the rule as first drafted is shown to result in occurrences so unsuitable as to provoke complaints and criticism (Nos. V, VI).

These Nissaggiyas where the rule had to be altered, although never more than once, thus contain two stories, one leading up to the first, and the other to the second version of the rule. The second version must be taken to annul the validity of the first. This however had to remain in the text for the sake of historical interest, and as to some extent explanatory of the force and wisdom of the second version. Had it been omitted, the incidents showing its shortcomings and its need for revision could not have been used as testimony that

such shortcomings were remediable and such revision necessary and reasonable.

In these six Nissaggiyas where a rule is formulated twice, the first version is always followed by the phrase, "And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord." There is no instance of this phrase occurring either after the second formulation of the rule, or in any of the remaining twenty-four Nissaggiyas where the rule is framed once only.

Yet in the text of the *Vinaya* is every rule, whether it had to be revised or not, and every amended rule, ascribed to Gotama. The formula so very definitely attributing "to the lord" only those rules that had to be altered is to my mind somewhat inexplicable. It is not peculiar to the Nissaggiyas, but occurs throughout the Vibhaṅga. It is possible that the occurrence of this phrase points to some comparatively old stratum in the Suttavibhaṅga, where only those rules, so pointedly said to have been laid down "by the lord," were genuinely prescribed by him; but that then there came a case, perhaps before, perhaps after his death, which made it clear that a revision and a more exact delimitation of the rule already formulated was wanted in the interests of reason, decency or justice.

Such revision may then in fact have been made, not by the founder, but by one of his followers or by the *saṁgha*. Or a decision may have been taken at the final recension of the "texts" to attribute all rules to the lord, so as to invest them with his authority. Even so, the mystery remains why this phrase, "And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord," was appended only to those rules which, as the history of the Order shows, had to be altered, and not to those whose original version has been able to stand and operate down the centuries.

It is something more than coincidence, and looks like adherence to some thought-out pattern, that in the six Nissaggiyas where a rule is twice formulated there should occur, after its first formulation, this phrase ascribing its setting forth "to the lord," and before its second

formulation an *anujānāmi*, an "allowance." In each case the *anujānāmi* occurs in the talk which, before the rule was revised, is reputed to have been given by Gotama to monks. Its effect is not to tighten but to mitigate the force and application of the rule as first drawn up. An *anujānāmi* however also occurs in five of the remaining twenty-four Nissaggiyas (Nos. III, XV, XXII, XXVIII, XXIX), not immediately before, but some way before the rule, here of course formulated only once.

In the Nissaggiya group of rules, there occurs the formulation of four *dukkaṭa* offences, those of wrong-doing. Each of these is ascribed to Gotama. Many others appear in the material placed after the Old Commentary, but it is not said of these that he was the author.

Most rare it is to find, as in Nissag. I and XXI, which have several other points in common, a short story leading up to the drafting of an offence of wrong-doing placed *after* the *anapātti* (no offence) clauses.[1] As would be expected, the story and the offence are pertinent to the matter in hand.

In Nissag. VI the *anujānāmi*, which is unusually long, ends, exceptionally for the Nissaggiya section, in the formulation of a *dukkaṭa* offence. It immediately precedes the second drafting of the rule.

In Nissag. XXII, which because of some peculiarities that it contains I shall discuss more fully below, the first story introduces, not a *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence, but one of wrong-doing.

The occurrence of *dukkaṭa* offences in Nis. VI and XXII before the final formulation of the rule, no less than their ascription to the lord, should correct the impression given at *Vinaya Texts* i. xxv that the term *dukkaṭa* "occurs only in . . . the latest portion of the Piṭaka," that is in "the Notes giving the exceptions to, and the extensions of the Rule in the Pātimokkha" (*ibid.*, p. xix), which are always placed after the Old Commentary.

[1] Similarly at Bhikkhunī Nissaggiya I.

As a general rule, the Padabhājaniya states that forfeiture and confession were to be made to an Order, that is to any part of the whole Order, five monks or more,[1] living within one boundary, *sīmā*, or within one residence, *āvāsa*; or to a group, *gaṇa*,[2] of monks, that is to a group of from two to four monks; or to an individual monk. When the article had been forfeited and the offence confessed, the offence was to be acknowledged, in the first two instances, by " an experienced, competent monk "; in the third by the monk to whom the forfeiture and confession had been made. The forfeited article was then to be given back to the monk who, having acquired it wrongfully, had forfeited it.

The value of the *nissaggiya pācittiya* type of penalty was, I think, in the eyes of the framer or framers of the Pātimokkha rules, its deterrent effect on the commission of further similar offences, and its redemptive power for each particular offender. It was apparently held that an offence whose penalty was of this nature was annulled by confessing it and having it acknowledged, combined with this hardly more than symbolic act of forfeiting the article wrongfully acquired. This involved some formality, but evidently the offence was not considered bad enough to warrant the offender's permanent loss of the goods he had obtained improperly.

Thus it is only true that " rules were required to prevent his (*i.e.*, a monk's) acquiring a store of property,"[3] on the assumption that these rules were deterrent and preventive and not retributive and revengeful. More important is it perhaps to realise that, behind this statutory limiting of possessions, there was the conviction that greed, craving, thirst, *taṇhā*, themselves undesirable, produced further undesirable states of mind.

It is true that any great emphasis on the monastic ideal, any clear expression of it, is lacking in the *Vinaya*, and is to be found almost exclusively in the *Suttapiṭaka*.

[1] Sizes of a *saṁgha*, order, are given at *Vin.* i. 319.

[2] In the Old Commentary, the phrase *sambahulā bhikkhū* also occurs, and appears often to be a synonym for *gaṇa*. See below, pp. 7, 8.

[3] E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 19.

The rules were probably, like the Rule of St. Benedict, to help the beginners, the backsliders, in their struggle towards "the lofty heights of virtue" and wisdom. Yet there is one notable occasion, in Nissaggiya XVII, when we are reminded of the end, the ideal, the thing sought, to which the *Vinaya* rules must be held to constitute a means of realisation. This is when the lord is shown as asking Mahāpajāpatī whether the nuns are "zealous, ardent, with a self that is striving," a triad of words belonging to Sutta material. To which she answers that while monks make them wash their sheep's wool for them, it is impossible for nuns to attend to "the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom," also a Sutta triad.

Conquest in this age-old struggle on the part of certain women to escape the ties of domesticity so as to seek the "further shore" is happily expressed in verses ascribed to Sumangala's mother:[1]

"O woman well set free! how free am I,
How thoroughly free from kitchen drudgery!
Me stained and squalid 'mong my cooking-pots,
My brutal husband ranked as even less
Than the sunshades he sits and weaves alway."

Yet although references to the need for ideals and their value, and for man's inner spiritual and mental training and the means of attaining these, may be practically absent from the *Vinaya*, there is no doubt that its legal and somewhat austere character is based on a high and mature standard of morality, justice and commonsense.

There are three exceptions to the Nissaggiyas' customary insistence on the return of the forfeited article to the monk who had come by it unlawfully, and had forfeited it, only to be given it back again. And there are three exceptions to their usual instruction that forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual monk. The same three

[1] Thīg. 23.

Nissaggiyas, Nos. XVIII, XIX, XXII, share both these irregularities.

Nissaggiyas XVIII and XIX are both concerned with gold and silver, called *jātarūparajata*[1] in the one case, and *rūpiya*[1] in the other. The Old Commentary on these Nissaggiyas requires a monk who has picked up gold and silver (No. XVIII), or who has entered into various transactions in which they are used (No. XIX), to make forfeiture in the midst of the Order, *saṁghamajjhe*. It does not give the usual alternatives of forfeiting to a group or an individual. That these commodities may not be forfeited to either of these parties is precluded by the rule of Nissaggiya XVIII itself, for this lays it down as an offence for a monk to have gold and silver in his possession. The *saṁgha* is more impersonal, and is, when need arises, a body of monks in their official character, with the functions of discharging legal and juridical business and of carrying out formal acts.

But although the *saṁgha* may receive the forfeited gold and silver, it may neither retain them nor return them to the monk who forfeited them. It must either hand them over to some lay person, asking him to bring medicines in exchange, or, failing this, the Order must appoint from among its number a "silver-remover," *rūpiyachaḍḍaka*, whose office it is to dispose of whatever mediums of exchange *rūpiya* and *jātarūparajata* denote.

Of the various objects with which the rules of the Nissaggiyas are concerned, gold and silver are the only ones which a monk might in no circumstances have in his possession. Clearly he had access to them, for his association with the laity was but little restricted.

Similarly Nissaggiya XXII, besides precluding forfeiture and confession to either a group or an individual, also debars the return of the forfeited article, here a bowl, to the monk who forfeited it. But he is to be given another bowl in its place. This is unique in the Nissaggiyas. It is also unique to find given in the rule itself the method of forfeiture. This is otherwise in-

[1] On these terms see below, p. 100, n. 2.

variably, and solely, found in the Old Commentary. Here the method of forfeiture enjoined in the rule appears again, though in more detailed form, in the Old Commentary.

The *sikkhāpada* of Nissaggiya XXII, after stating that a monk who, getting another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended in less than five places, incurs an offence, proceeds to say: " That bowl must be forfeited by that (offending) monk to a *bhikkhuparisā* (company, assembly, congregation of monks). And whatever is the last bowl (*pattapariyanta*) belonging to that company of monks, it should be given to that monk, with the words, ' Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.' "

It is interesting to find that the new bowl got in exchange for the mended bowl is subject to forfeiture only to the Order. This suggests that bowls were regarded at some time as more especially communal property than were robes,[1] or the other objects in regard to which a monk might commit an offence involving forfeiture. Yet in Nissaggiya XXI, an extra bowl, if it had been used for more than ten days, might be forfeited either to an Order or to a group or to an individual. Nevertheless the injunction which occurs at the end of the *sikkhāpada* of Nissaggiya XXII reveals a closer concern for communal ownership and property than do the other Nissaggiya *sikkhāpadas*. In these others, although the Order, or a section of it, may receive the forfeited article, it also, with the exception of Nos. XVIII and XIX, returns it, the community as a whole assuming no further responsibility.

At the end of Nissaggiya XXI, it is said that failure to give back a bowl that had been forfeited entails a *dukkaṭa* offence.[2] Yet in Nissaggiya XXII it appears

[1] On a monk's death, his robes did not necessarily return to the Order. He could bequeath them to the monk who had nursed him or to a pupil. Moreover, robe-material might be presented to individual monks, if the laity so wished. See Nissag. VIII, IX, X.

[2] *Cf.* end of Nis. I, where same offence incurred by failure to give back a robe.

that a bowl on being forfeited becomes an extra bowl for a company of monks and is absorbed into their stock of bowls. The result of an Order's obtaining an additional bowl in this way is that all its members are liable to profit. For their bowls, on the accretion of this extra one, may all be shuffled round. But this is not to be done haphazard. The rule has given concise directions for the right procedure, and these are followed and expanded at some length by the Old Commentary.

There is a still further way in which Nissaggiya XXII is unique among the Nissaggiyas. It contains three stories instead of, as is normal, one, or, as in six cases, two. This means that a chain of three connected circumstances have arisen, each of which demands jurisdiction. The curious thing is, that the first story does not end with the formulation of a *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence, but with that of an offence of wrong-doing. This is to the effect that a monk must not ask for a bowl. But monks observed this precept too scrupulously. Lay people complained that, by receiving almsfood into their hands, they resembled members of other sects. So Gotama, it is said, made an "allowance" moderating the *dukkaṭa* rule, and permitting monks to ask for a bowl when theirs were broken or destroyed. But because the six monks abused this privilege, the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule was formulated.

I have dwelt on Nissaggiya XXII at some length, for I think that, even as there are some grounds for holding that Saṅghâdisesa XII may represent some specially ancient fragment of the Pātimokkha,[1] so likewise may this Nissaggiya.

In the first place, the term *bhikkhuparisā*, because it merely indicates an assembly, a company of monks, may belong to those earlier days before Gotama's followers were fully organised into a *saṁgha*, bound by the same observances and obligations, the same rules and (formal) acts, and living in the same communion.

[1] See *B.D.* i. xxviii f.

It is possible that, in such a context, *bhikkhu* did not mean all that at some time it came to mean. Secondly, the mention of this "company of monks" as the recipient body of a forfeited bowl may point to a time when communal ownership was more actual than nominal. Thirdly, the need for stating, in the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule itself, that the article wrongfully acquired must be forfeited, suggests that this rule antedates the other Nissaggiyas, and belongs to a time when forfeiture was new as a penalty, and when therefore the method of carrying it out had to be plainly stated. Fourthly, one might suppose that the first story in this Nissaggiyȧ purports to be recounting unsuitable behaviour in an early follower of Gotama. For the early followers, it may be presumed, entering from a more urgent sense of religion, committed less serious offences than the later, and hence incurred lighter penalties.

The appointment of two officials is mentioned in the Nissaggiyas, that of silver-remover (No. XVIII) and that of assigner of bowls (No. XXII). The duty of both is to deal with the results of offences, and not with the distribution of articles, such as robes and lodgings, lawfully acquired. Appointments of officials were not of one officer for the whole *saṁgha*, but of an officer for any of those lesser sections of it which, dwelling within one boundary or residence, were, to the not negligible confusion of later historians, also called *saṁgha*. Even so, we do not know whether each of these *saṁghas* always appointed every possible official, ready to function—and a not inconsiderable number are named throughout the *Vinaya*—or if only those were appointed when occasion demanded their service. Nor do we know whether an official, once appointed, held his post permanently or temporarily.

I think it fairly safe to presume the latter. Monks travelled a great deal on the one hand, and on the other had to spend the three or four months of the rains in one residence with other monks. Had two permanent office-bearers met, and a case within their orbit arisen, a ruling would have been necessary as to which one,

such as the senior or the one first arrived, was to deal with the situation. But there is no record of any such event.

It seems more likely, and the internal evidence, such as it is, points this way, that the authorised procedure for appointing the officials was prescribed as the need for this or that official was felt. Thus a similar appointment could be correctly made if and when future need arose. But if there was, for example, no occasion for a silver-remover or an assigner of bowls, which could only be because no monk had acquired gold and silver or a new bowl in exchange for one mended in less than five places, then there was no obligation to appoint a monk to fill either of these offices.

The procedure for the appointment of the officials is in each case much the same; and they have to be "agreed upon" by the entire Order affected. This well illustrates the democratic nature of the monastic institution. Two other "agreements of the monks," *bhikkhusammuti*, are described in the Nissaggiyas (Nos. II, XIV), and again the responsibility for making the required agreement is shown to be vested in the whole organism, and not in any one of its members.

Some English translations of Pali words and phrases appear to have become almost traditional by now, and hence attract little critical attention. Such a phrase is *pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, "taking the bowl and robe." It is the occurrence of this phrase in Nissaggiya V, together with the mention of various sorts of robes, that has raised the question *of which robe* it is that is here referred to in the phrase.

Dialogues ii. 162, n. 1, describes the three usual robes of a monk as the inner one worn in the residence, the upper robe put on before a monk left the monastery and went out to a village, and the outer cloak carried, and put on near the outskirts of the village. If this is a correct interpretation—and it is the one generally accepted—the phrase *pubbaṇhasamayaṃ nivāsetvā* would appear to mean, "having dressed in the morning in the

upper robe." This implies that the monk will already have put on his inner robe to wear in the residence, if indeed he had not slept in it, but later put on his upper robe with a view to going on his almsround. Again, the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, which as a rule immediately follows this other one, would in effect mean, "taking the outer cloak and the bowl." I think it possible however that if the *cīvara* of this phrase did at some time come to refer exclusively to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak, it may not always have done so. For it is hard to see the sense that such an interpretation could make in Nissaggiya V, as I hope to show. On the other hand, the occurrence of the phrase here may be due to some later editorial addition to the story.

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā is elsewhere in the *Vinaya*[1] the focus of an alteration in the rules on jungle-dwelling for nuns. Here too another episode in her life, as this is recorded in Nissaggiya V, is the centre round which turn some intricate questions with regard to robes.

According to this Nissaggiya, Uppalavaṇṇā, in the stereotyped phrase, "having dressed in the morning and taking her bowl and robe," *pubbaṇhasamayaṃ nivāsetvā pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, had gone to Sāvatthī for almsfood. She had then used her upper robe, *uttarāsaṅga*, to tie up some meat. She next gave her inner robe, *antaravāsaka*, to the monk Udāyin, although protesting that it was her last, her fifth robe, *idañ ca me antimaṃ pañcimaṃ cīvaraṃ*. And finally it is said that on her return to the nunnery, the nuns receiving from her her bowl and robe, *pattacīvaraṃ paṭigaṇhantiyo*, asked her where her inner robe was.

The question is, which of the five robes allowable to a nun did she set out "taking," and which did the nuns "receive" from her when she came back to the nunnery?

The five robes of a nun, mentioned also at *Vin.* iv. 218, 282, are named at *Vin.* ii. 272 as the three usual robes worn also by monks, with the addition of the vest or bodice, *saṃkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth, and

[1] *Vin.* iii. 35 ff.=*B.D.* i. 53 ff.

it is said that these should be pointed out to women wishing to receive the *upasampadā*. At *Vin.* iv. 345 it is laid down as an offence of expiation for a nun to enter a village without her bodice, that is without having this on under her inner robe. Bu. at *VA.* 663 assumes that Uppalavaṇṇa had on her bodice, for he says, " dressed in (*nivattha*) her bodice, and showing only the palms of her hands . . . she went away," that is from Udāyin. We know that she had had her upper robe, and suspect that it was accounted for by the phrase, " having dressed in the morning." Likewise, on account of the phrase, " taking her bowl and robe," she should have had her outer cloak with her. But had she in fact had this, surely she would have put it on. Yet in the narrative of her meeting with Udāyin, there is no suggestion that she was either carrying it or wearing it.

Either therefore " having dressed in the morning " refers to putting on the *inner* robe, and " taking the bowl and robe " to the *upper* robe, and not to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak; or this latter phrase is some later interpolation.

Now at *Vin.* i. 298 it is a *dukkaṭa* offence to enter a village wearing only the inner and the upper robes, that is without the outer cloak. This rule, be it noticed, was made in reference to monks, and I do not think that it applies to nuns.[1] For at *Vin.* iv. 281 it is a *pācittiya* offence for nuns, having laid aside the *cīvara*, here certainly the outer cloak, to go into the country for more than five days with only the inner and the upper robes. Therefore if, at the time to which Nissaggiya V purports to refer, a nun did *not* have to go into a village on her morning almsround taking her outer

[1] It is too facilely said by some writers that the *Vinaya* for nuns is a mere copy of that for monks—*e.g.*, H. Kern, *Man. Ind. Buddhism*, p. 86; though it is probable that the Pātimokkha of the nuns was " modelled on " that of the monks; *cf.* E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Ind. Thought*, 15, n. 1; M. Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.* ii. 24, speaking of it as " a similar code compiled later for the nuns "; Miss D. Bhagvat, *Early Bud. Jurisprudence*, p. 18, as a " mere imitation of the former "—*i.e.*, the Bhikkhu-pātimokkha.

cloak, Uppalavaṇṇā may have "taken" merely her upper robe. She would then have returned to the nunnery dressed only in her bodice, as Bu. seems to imply.

With the growing disparagement of nakedness in monks and nuns,[1] the robe the nuns "received" from her would hardly have been her bodice. Besides, this "receiving" of a bowl and robe from an incoming monk or nun came to be but a recognised, standardised act. It would thus appear possible that the discrepancy which exists may be attributable to a later interpolation of the phrase which denotes this act of respect done to a monk or nun on coming back to the residence.

If we allow that the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, of the beginning of the story, betrays neither the marks of interpolation nor of accredited meaning, but signifies taking the *upper* robe, then we are almost forced to see the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ paṭiganhantiyo*, towards the conclusion of the story, as some additional matter. For if the course of the story is carefully followed, it is impossible to identify these two *cīvara* the one with the other.

Thus an explanation of the discrepancy between whatever robes it was that these phrases are intended to signify is that this Nissaggiya has suffered some careless "editorial" gloss or glosses. The point itself may be small and of no particular importance. But every instance of perceptible "curling and combing"[2] of the texts must make us the more alive to the possibility of their patchwork nature, their composite "authorship," to their gradual alterations and additions, and probably to their losses too.

Having taken an instance of the translation of a frequent phrase, whose latent reference has been perhaps too little questioned, and hence too easily regarded as uniformly specific, I turn now to a word, *santhata*, and

[1] *Cf. Vin.* i. 292, 293, 305; iv. 278; and below, pp. 45, 134.

[2] A phrase I borrow from Mrs. Rhys Davids, "Poems by Monk and Nun," *Rev. of Religion*, January, 1940, p. 129.

the verb, *santharati*(=*saṃ*+*stṛ*), of which it is the past participle. In this case it is owing to the comparative infrequency of these two words that their latent reference has been too little questioned on the one hand, but on the other not fully perceived to be specific.

In Nissaggiyas XI-XV, *santhata* occurs as a neuter noun,[1] meaning a rug or mat.[2] Because there are other words for rug, mat, carpet, ground-covering, sheet and so on, the problem before us is to find the differentiating feature peculiar to the kind of rug called *santhata*, the particular characteristic in virtue of which it was so named. For neither the Old Commentary nor Buddhaghosa describes the finished article; they concentrate instead on the process of making it. The result of the process is what in the text of the introductory stories and the *sikkhāpadas* is called a *santhata*.

The Old Commentary is very terse, but, by exclusion, informative: *santhata* means, what comes to be made having spread, not woven, *santharitvā kataṃ hoti avāyimaṃ*. Thus *santharitvā* in this definition needs some word to be supplied as its object, such as one representing the material used in making the article by this process known as *santharati*. Bu., at *VA*. 684, describes the technique of what the Old Commentary, in defining *santhata*, calls *santharitvā*, by saying, "it is made having spread (*santharitvā*) silk[3] filaments (*aṁsu*) one upon the other on a level piece of ground, having poured boiled rice (or corn) and so on over the silk filaments."

This then is the kind of process meant by *santhata*,

[1] As p.p., see *e.g. D*. ii. 160, *Sn*. 401, 668; also the stock-phrase, *dhamani-santhata-gatta*, having the limbs strewn with veins. As a noun, *santhata* occurs only once elsewhere, *Vv*. 63, 5.

[2] *P.E.D.*, B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 53, "rug or mat"; E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 19, "rug." *Vin. Texts* i. 24 translates "rug or mat" and "rug"; Huber, *J.As.*, 1913, p. 497, "couverture"; Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, p. 20, "mat."

[3] "Silk" is not essential to the argument. This part of the Commentary is referring to Nissag. XI, where monks thought of making *santhata* mixed with silk. In Nissag. XII-XIV they were made of wool.

and it is the only one described. It seems that the basic material of which the article was being made was spread out in layers, in strata all running the same way, and not cross-wise so as to be woven, and that it was then somehow welded together by pouring boiling rice over it. The result of this operation was a *santhata*, a thing made by this process.

Childers defines the cognate noun, *santhāra*, as "layer, stratum"; and there are passages in the *Vinaya* and the Suttas[1] where *santharati*, used largely in connection with preparing a council-hall, must mean to spread or to strew most probably in layers, by a spreading method of layering. This, at all events, is the view held by the commentator[2] who describes the arrangement of covering the ground with cow-dung, scents, coloured mats, fleecy rugs, and skins of various animals, all one above (*upari*) the other. It is unfortunate that the commentator, in thus defining *santharitvā*, more than once uses the word itself. In spite of this, the description is of inestimable help in arriving at a fuller understanding of what *santharati* implies.

If my hypothesis is correct, the cognate verb *attharati* (=*ā*+*stṛ*) would denote the simpler act of spreading, covering, laying out, but not in layers, and as it were once only or one thing only, such as cloth (*Vin*. i. 254 ff.) or a bridge (*Jā*. i. 199). It would then follow that *santharati*, when used with reference to spreading a couch or chair or mattress or stool,[3] must mean not simply the act of putting out the couch or chair unfurnished, but converting it into something fit to sit on or lie on. This could be done by spreading on it or under it different coverings, in layers: the sheet, *paccattharaṇa*, the ground-covering, *bhummattharaṇa*, for example. These coverings would in no way be held together as though woven, but would be spread one on top of the other.

For the translation of *santhata* in Nissaggiyas XI-XV

[1] *Vin*. i. 227; *D*. ii. 84, iii. 208; *Ud*. VIII. 6; *M*. i. 354.

[2] *MA*. iii. 18; *UdA*. 409.

[3] See below, p. 238 f.

I have chosen "rug" in preference to "mat," because it seems desirable to convey the impression that a *santhata* was something that could both be sat on and also worn wrapped round the body. The Old Commentary on Nissaggiya XV defines *purāṇa-santhata*, an old, used or soiled *santhata*, in exactly the same terms as it uses to define *purāṇa-cīvara*, an old, used or soiled robe. Of both it says that they mean, "dressed in it once, put on once," using for this the words *nivāseti* and *pārupati*, which usually refer to the complete dressing in the monk's three robes. Bu. defines these words, "dressed in" and "put on," as "sat on" and "lain on" (*VA*. 687). Yet on the very same page he speaks of a *santhata* "counting as a fourth robe."

But for Bu. apparently these two definitions are not impossible of reconciliation. For in his exegesis on Nissaggiya IV he says (*VA*. 660) that a robe is called "old" (*i.e.*, dressed in it once, put on once) if a monk lies on it, using it as a pillow. Thus a robe, meant to be worn, could also on occasion be used to lie on.

As the *Vinaya* itself provides no evidence as to what exactly *santhata* means, whether it is a rug or a mat, although it describes the process by which it is made, I have followed the commentator in regarding the article as something that could either be sat on or worn. "Rug" rather more accurately than "mat" seems to cover these two usages which, by the time of Buddhaghosa at any rate, appear to have grown into the meaning of *santhata*.

The *nisīdana-santhata* of Nissaggiya XV is not a species of *santhata*, but of *nisīdana*, and is a piece of cloth to sit upon (*nisīdana*) made with the addition of part of an old *santhata*. A *nisīdana* was so called if it had a border.[1] But the reason why a border came to be allowed, together with its correct measurements, is given at *Vin*. iv. 170 f., and has nothing to do with the need to add part of a *santhata* to a *nisīdana*.

[1] *Vin*. iii. 232, iv. 123, 171.

THE PĀCITTIYA GROUP (NOS. I-LX)

A curious feature of the Pācittiyas is that the Old Commentary on these rules nowhere explains what is meant by *pācittiya*, the offence which gives its name to this whole section. It is from the phrase *āpatti desetabbā*, occurring in the Vibhaṅga on each Nissaggiya, that we infer that *pācittiya* is an offence to be confessed; and even as forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual, so we may conclude that the same holds good when the offence is one whose penalty is merely that of expiation, of confession unaccompanied by forfeiture.

By and large each Pācittiya is composed on the same general lines as the other classes of rules in the Suttavibhaṅga: introductory story, rule, sometimes another story, even more than one, with the amended version or versions of the rule, Old Commentary, other exegetical material, and a list of no offences against the rule. There are, as in the Nissaggiyas, irregularities and variations from this customary pattern. These cannot be analysed until the translation of the ninety-two Pācittiyas is complete, and even then it will be doubtful whether they will throw any light on "the comparative age of any different parts of the Pātimokkha."[1]

One thing however we can do now, and it is not altogether unimportant. We can correct the misapprehension into which the editors of *Vinaya Texts* fell, and which I,[2] among others,[3] have hitherto followed too uncritically. For it is not quite the case that the Old Commentary is a "word for word commentary upon"[4] each of these rules, although undoubtedly it is nearly so. Setting aside the occasions where words are defined by themselves, but nevertheless defined, there yet remain a few distinct but notable lapses and

[1] *Vin. Texts* i. xiv. [2] *B.D.* i. xxxiii.
[3] S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, 91; M. Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.* ii. 24. [4] *Vin. Texts* i. xv.

omissions, some words of a rule not being commented upon at all. There is no attempt in the Old Commentary to explain "water (that) contains life" (Pāc. XX), "monk arrived first" (Pāc. XVI), or "in destruction of" (vegetable growth) (Pāc. XI), although in the last case the paragraph following the Old Commentary's definition of "vegetable growth" leads us to suppose that "destruction" means cutting, breaking and cooking.

Sāvatthī, again with a large majority, is said to be the locus of thirty-nine of these sixty Pācittiyas, Rājagaha of six, Kosambī of five, Vesālī and Āḷavī each of four, Kapilavatthu of two and Suṃsumāragiri of one. The total of sixty-one is accounted for by the fact that, in Pāc. V, the first version of the rule is reputed to have been formulated when Gotama was at Āḷavī, and the second when he had moved on from there to Kosambī.

The critics, as a result of whose complaints Pācittiya rules for monks were made or revised, are thirty-five times shown to have been the "modest monks," fifteen times "people," *manussa*, to which must be added the criticism of a lay-woman (Pāc. VII, both stories), of a man (Pāc. XLV), of a poor workman (Pāc. XXXIII), of Mahānāma Sakka (Pāc. XLVII), and of hirelings of the king (Pāc. LVIII). Four times the nuns complain, once the *titthiyas*, once a brahmin, once *upāsakā*, lay-followers.

These last, also, upon one occasion (Pāc. XLI) are recorded to have told Gotama how monks might avoid bringing discredit on themselves from members of other sects; he laid down a rule in accordance with their representations. Once King Pasenadi thought of a device by which Gotama might know that monks had been behaving indecorously (Pāc. LIII). Five times, it appears, Gotama discovered by direct observation or by questioning that legislation was required. By a too fastidious adherence to a rule, it is on several occasions demonstrated to be unsatisfactory, and is revised.

Thus the total number of rules appearing in these

Pācittiyas is greater than sixty. It is not uniformly the case, as in the Nissaggiya section, that when a rule is amended, it is amended once only. At least three of these sixty Pācittiyas provide evidence of a long struggle to get the rule right. In Pāc. XXXII the rule on a group-meal, *gaṇabhojana*, revised seven times, results finally in seven legalised exceptions being allowed to the offence, as it otherwise remains, of eating in a group. To the ruling on *paraṃparabhojana* (Pāc. XXXIII), eating meals out of the turns in which they have been offered, four exceptions are sanctioned. Thirdly, six exceptions are made to the rule that a monk should not bathe at intervals of less than half a month (Pāc. LVII).

A consideration of the reasons leading to the exceptions made to these, as to several other rules, reveals something of the care and vigilance needed for the smooth running of the Buddhist cenobium, impinging as it did on various elements and aspects of the society of the day. The laity were, on the one hand, not to be drained of their resources, on the other, not to be refused when they offered food, as this might result in wounding their spirit of generosity, in dashing their hope of merit, and in the loss to monks of the robe-material which the laity, at the right time of year, gave to members of the Orders with meals. Nor were the laity to be kept waiting. At least I think that that, as much as the discourtesy of refusing the offer, made to monks who were travelling, to "eat just here," and which looks as if the lay-people were willing to provide the meal, is at the root of two exceptions, made at Pāc. XXXIII. 5 and 6. For there are various times in Nissaggiya and Pācittiya when lay-people are recorded to be annoyed with monks for keeping them waiting.

At Pāc. XXXIII. 4 it is obvious that the assigning to another monk of a meal that is expected later is a device for overcoming the rudeness, otherwise involved, of refusing food that is actually being offered. Nor, so it emerges, is it polite to refuse an invitation given to

a meal by a wanderer, a *paribbājaka-samāpanna.* A naked ascetic, *ājīvaka,* had, as is stated, on Bimbisāra's advice, asked the monks to a meal with him, but they had refused (Pāc. XXXIII. 8).

Incidentally this story reveals the necessity for keeping the friendship of the kings, on whom the success of the Order largely depended. They did much to set the fashion in faith. I have mentioned Pasenadi's device for letting the lord know, but without himself speaking to him, that he had seen monks, *arahans* at that, sporting in the water. Mallikā, his queen, was of the opinion either that there was no rule against this, or that these monks did not know about it. Apparently her first surmise was right. The third mention of a king in these sixty Pācittiyas is again of Bimbisāra. Because monks, by bathing until after dark, kept him waiting his turn, for it appears that he did not wish to disturb them, a rule, severe compared with its cause, was formulated forbidding monks to bathe at intervals of less than half a month (Pāc. LVII). But this proved deleterious to robes and lodgings. For in the hot weather, the fever weather, at a time of wind and rain, when making repairs or going on a journey, monks lay down to rest with their limbs damp from rain or sweat. And the restriction on bathing was uncomfortable for those who were ill. This is a rule whose various adjustments are the direct outcome of a tropical climate.

I think that the growing needs of the monks, as expressed for example in the exceptions to Pāc. LVII, and also in the acquisition of more and more accessories, recounted principally in the *Mahāvagga,* does not necessarily indicate soft-living and greed on their part, but a desire to keep what they had properly and cleanly, to use it as efficiently as possible, and to keep themselves in a good state of health, for this was regarded as an essential basis for leading the higher life. Four great, perpetual and destructive enemies against which man has to fight in India are the heat of the sun, the damp of the rains, the strength of the winds blowing up dust and dirt, and the persistent ravages of insects. When

the *Vinaya* has been exhaustively studied, I believe it may as often as not be found that the desire and its sanction to acquire various objects in order to preserve others, or to lessen by making exceptions the constraint of some rules, will prove to be attributable to one or other of these forces of nature.

Illness, though not gone into in detail, is however kept in mind by the constant allusion to provisions made for the comfort of ill monks. Such provisions are usually contained in a *sikkhāpada*, or an *anujānāmi*, or both. The permission to bathe more often than once a fortnight is a case in point. Again, a monk, if ill, is allowed to eat more than one meal in succession at a public rest-house (Pāc. XXXI), to kindle a fire for warming himself (Pāc. LVI), and a nun who is ill may receive exhortation from a monk in the nunnery instead of going to the monk's quarters (Pāc. XXIII).

Of these sixty Pācittiya rules for monks, fifteen are devoted to rules for eating, Nos. XXIX, XXXI-XLIII, XLVI. None occur in Pāc. LXI-XCII. Since therefore all the Pācittiya ordinances falling under this head are contained in this volume, it is possible to allude to various points arising from them here; I have already drawn attention to some. Rules concerned with the exhortation of nuns are arranged exclusively in Pāc. XXI-XXIV, but as I have discussed these elsewhere,[1] I shall not do so again now. Rules regarding the army and, to all intents and purposes, robes come only within this volume. Other rules cannot be so profitably discussed until the Pācittiya translation is completed.

In these rules, which cannot always be fully understood unless read in conjunction alike with their introductory stories, the Old Commentary and the *anāpatti* clauses, much diverse and interesting material comes to light. It would be a long and delicate business to investigate all the ramifications, and to connect these with those other parts of the *Vinaya* to which they sometimes

[1] *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 126 ff.

seem to refer. Merely to take two random examples from Pāc. XLVII. For understanding the definition of "time of giving robes" (=Pāc. XXXII), acquaintance with, for example, *MV.* vii is necessary. Again the fact that there is "no offence" if a monk is going to the nuns' quarters presupposes at least a knowledge of the Pācittiyas concerned with the exhortation of nuns.

The rules on eating are important for monks, for taking nothing but food given in alms involved a threefold maintenance of a correct attitude: towards the laity, towards members of other sects, and towards fellow monks. The same applies to robes, where also a monk's behaviour towards a nun has to be taken into account. It might indeed be said that a monk's attitude towards eating and robes epitomises his whole attitude towards the society of the day.

The Pācittiyas on meals and eating would provide material for an extensive essay. I have already referred to the group-meal and the out-of-turn meal,[1] that is to two ways in which, leaving aside the exceptions, a meal might not be eaten. Here I shall do no more than note down some of the more outstanding words for various kinds of meals, that is for classes of food named. Notes will be found appended to these words where they appear in the text.

(1) The five kinds of meals, *pañca bhojanāni*, given in the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV as rice-gruel, food made with flour, barley, fish, meat, and mentioned in the *anāpatti* clauses of Pāc. XXIX, XXXI-XXXIII, are used in the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV to define "soft food," *bhojaniya*.

(2) "Solid food" is defined by exclusion. In Pāc. XXXV it is everything except the five soft foods and food that may be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days and during life. These last three categories seem to refer solely to medicines. In Pāc. XLI solid food is everything but the five soft foods and water for cleansing the teeth.

[1] Above, p. xxvii.

(3) Five other classes of food are given in the *anāpatti* clauses of Pāc. XXXII, XXXIII, dependent on how and when given: the regular supply of food, that allowed by ticket, that given on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, on an observance day, and on the day after this.

(4) Comparing the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV and XLII, it appears that *yāgu*, conjey, ranks neither as a solid food nor as a soft food.

(5) In Pāc. XXXIX the five standard medicines, and meat and fish (two of the soft foods) with milk and curds are called "sumptuous foods," *paṇītabhojanāni*.

(6) Solid food or soft food that is not left over, *anatiritta*, and solid or soft food that is left over, *atiritta*, are mentioned in Pāc. XXXV.

There is nothing very special to say about the Pācittiya rules for robes. These receive a large share of legislation in the Nissaggiyas, and are given comparatively scant attention in the Pācittiyas. Their rules constitute two small groups: Nos. XXV, XXVI, LVIII-LX; again, but not in this volume, Nos. LXXIX and XCII.

A monk incurs an offence of expiation if he gives a robe to a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange (Pāc. XXV and *cf.* Nis. V). This rule was the outcome of generosity on a monk's part, not of greed. The first draft had to be revised because nuns were affronted that monks would not even exchange robes with them. Again, an offence is incurred (1) if a monk sews a robe for a nun who is not a relation (Pāc. XXVI)—the result of Udāyin's obscene design on a nun's robe; (2) if he does not use one of the three prescribed modes of disfiguring a new robe, apparently so as to be able to recognise it (Pāc. LVIII, and whose *anāpatti* clauses should be read in conjunction with *Vin.* i. 254, 255); (3) if he uses a robe after having assigned it to a member of any of the five classes of his co-religionists (Pāc. LIX), for clearly these must be able to rely on an assignment; and (4) if he hides a robe or a bowl or various other

specified requisites belonging to another monk (Pāc. LX). Pāc. LXXXI should be compared with Pāc. LIX. Pāc. XCII declares it an offence for a monk to have a robe made up to the measure of a Sugata's robe, or larger. It will be noticed that Pāc. XXV and LIX provide evidence that a monk had power to dispose of a robe in his possession, either by exchange or assignment, a point which wars against the view that the Order was the owner of the robes, even after they had been allotted or assigned to individual monks.

A set of three Pācittiya rules (Nos. XLVIII-L) came to be laid down for the conduct to be observed by monks in regard to an army. There is no blinking of facts, no pretence of ignoring the existence of armies as part of the structure of worldly life, either here or in various Sutta passages. Moreover, from the many military similes used to describe a man's (*puggala*, as at *A*. iii. 91 ff.) or a monk's (as at *A*. i. 184, ii. 116, 170, 202) successful mental purification and victorious spiritual battles, it is clear that fighting by kings, chieftains and soldiers, though never frankly condoned as in the *Gītā*, was yet on the whole not roundly censured. Two Sutta passages should however be specially remarked, the one in the *Saṃyutta*,[1] depicting the utter futility of war, for it settles nothing, does not stop the deed from rolling on; the other in the *Dhammapada*,[2] violently contrasting the use of force with the exercise of *dhamma*. *Dhamma*—conscience, duty, the moral "ought," the disciplinary rules, the body of teaching, and it has meant all of these—is arrayed against brute force. There is no doubt as to which is found the more fitting and the more admirable.

Even had not the intentional taking of life ranked as a Pārājika offence, there was yet the moral *sīla*, or principle, binding a monk to refrain from onslaught on creatures, and binding the laity too, but only on the fortnightly *uposatha* days. Thus, clearly, fighting by

---

[1] *S*. i. 85. [2] *Dhp*. 256, 257.

monks was condemned, and Buddhist monks could not become soldiers. In this respect they differ widely from the Western monk of the Middle Ages, who saw nothing incongruous in taking up arms.

Further, as these Pācittiyas show, a monk's dealings with an army were, though not forbidden outright, reduced to the minimum. For, contrary to the view sometimes put forward that Gotama and his followers were breakers of homes, it is apparent here as elsewhere in the canon that his relations were by no means inaccessible to a man once he had turned monk.

In Pāc. XLVIII, a monk is allowed to go and see an army fighting, if there is sufficient reason. This exception is a generalisation from the particular instance of a monk's wish to visit a sick relation who was in the army. But, having gone to the army, a monk is not to stay there for more than three nights (Pāc. XLIX), nor while there to witness manœuvres: sham fights, troops in array, the massing of the army, reviews (Pāc. L). This is a group where the later "rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."[1]

In all of these manœuvres the four "wings" of an army might participate: the elephants each requiring twelve men, the horses each with three men, the chariots each with four men, the infantry with (bows and) arrows.

In the *Jātaka* there is not infrequent reference to this fourfold composition of an army. But that it should be set down in considerable detail in the Old Commentary may be ascribed to the determination that, given lucid explanations, the monks should be in no doubt as to what was an army or part of one.

In each of these three monastic rules connected with an army, it is recorded that the laity, apparently a little stung by jealousy, complain of the monks' conduct. They realise that it is because of their own poor acquirement (*alābhā dulladdhaṃ* of good deeds) in the past that, in the present, they are brought into contact with fighting forces. The implication seems to be that for

[1] *Vin.* i. xvii.

a monk this should not be necessary or inevitable: being a monk he should be beyond the desire to witness fighting, real or sham, both because his *karma* in this respect should be worn away, and for fear lest he should engender a new bad *karma* for the future. In general terms it may be said that there is no offence if a monk sees an army or a conflict through no fault of his own, and not having gone of set purpose to see either the one or the other.

In their Introduction to *Vinaya Texts*,[1] Rhys Davids and Oldenberg have drawn attention to a curious irregularity in the method of framing some of the Pācittiya rules. In referring to the Pācittiyas and the apparent "effort to arrange the offences in groups (*vagga*) of ten," they raise the question of the three cases in which "we find regulations formulated with the utmost brevity (the offences being merely expressed by a locative case dependent upon *pācittiyaṃ*) at the commencement of such a *vagga*." And they go on to say, "It seems to us, at least in the present state of our knowledge, quite impossible to draw any conclusions from such peculiarities as to the comparative age of any different parts of the Pātimokkha." Now since all the Pācittiyas referred to fall within this volume, I will attempt to discuss them, but without necessarily, since "the present state of our knowledge" is still defective, trying to arrive at any conclusion.[2]

They are Pāc. I-III, XI-XIII, LI-LIV. Any attempt to trace a cause for the peculiar way in which the rule in each of these Pācittiyas is framed must depend to some extent upon the nature of the material found within these same Pācittiyas. Nothing as yet can be suggested as to why they stand at the beginning of their respective *vaggas*. I would only point out,

[1] *Vin. Texts* i. xiv.

[2] There are also the seven concluding Pācittiyas, 86-92, where the offence of expiation involves, not *nissaggiya*, forfeiture, but some other penalty in respect of an article made of the wrong material or to the wrong measure.

first, that in the Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga there is one Pācittiya, No. IV, which is of this same brief type, but it does not head a *vagga*; and secondly, that the Bhikkhu-Pācittiyas Nos. LXXII, LXXIII, although not of the brief type yet conform to it to the extent that, after some introductory material included in the rule and leading up to the formulation of the offence, the offence itself is expressed by a locative case dependent on *pācittiyaṃ*. These two rules do not head their division, and its first rule is framed in the normal manner.

Leaving Pācittiyas LXXII, LXXIII and Bhikkhunī-Pācittiya IV to one side, I will now summarise such outstanding features as are evinced by the three groups of rules which are "formulated with the utmost brevity," together with their attendant material.

(1) In Pāc. I, II, III (repeating II), XI, LIV, not only is the key-word or words (sometimes there are two) of the rule defined, but also the words used in such a definition are themselves defined. The definition of these words I believe not to belong to the original Old Commentary, but to a revised version of it. This is not however a point peculiar to these five Pācittiyas; for Pārājika IV and Pāc. X also define the words used in the definition of the words of the rule. To my mind such supplementary definitions portray a synthesis of thought, based on knowledge, which is far from primitive or tentative. Again, the very material of the rule of Pāc. XI, that it is an offence to destroy vegetable growth, may be compared with that of Pāc. X and XX, where it is an offence to dig the soil or to sprinkle water containing life. The sole purpose of all these three Pācittiyas is to preserve from harm creatures that are one-facultied. In this respect then Pāc. XI is not unique or peculiar. It may in addition be suitably compared with Pāc. X, as much for the similarity of guiding principle as for the defining of words used in definition.

The words used to define the definitions of the key-word of Pāc. II and III do not seem wholly contrived for monastic purposes. Why should "crafts," for example, be classified as "high and low" and then catalogued?

It was impossible for monks to follow any of the crafts mentioned. Such painstaking analysis of all the ten ways in which "insulting speech" and "slander" might be made seems to point to later days when classification and analysis had come to be in vogue.

(2) I suppose that in the introductory story of Pāc. II, the group of six monks when they jeered at the well-behaved monks about five out of ten things—birth, name, clan, work, craft—must have had in mind the social position and the occupation held by these while they were still "in the world." For all such considerations should count as nothing once a man had become a monk. The offence was summarised as one of "insulting speech," and not as one of probing into matters whose importance to monks should be infinitesimal. Nor can one say of Gotama's Order that, as time went on, such considerations came to be of account, or that the richer and better-born entrants came to hold the more influential positions. This has never been the case. The influence of the members has always depended on their mental and spiritual attainments alone, or on some gift of character. This backward view, if such it is meant to be, into a monk's past is unique in the Pācittiyas. But yet I cannot see that it affords any data for the comparative age of this Pācittiya.

(3) Pāc. II has a reference to *lekhā*. If this is writing, which, partly owing to the paucity of references alike to it and to writing-materials, is assumed to be an art of later discovery, then a clue is at once established for a comparatively late date of this Pācittiya, or at any rate of a portion of it; *or* to writing being less a "later discovery" than is hitherto assumed.

(4) Pāc. I contains a long and sophisticated analysis of the way in which an offence of expiation is incurred by the three and the seven ways of telling a conscious lie. This may be compared with the beginning of a similar analysis in Pārājika IV[1] of the incurment of an offence involving defeat by the three and the seven

[1] *Vin.* iii. 93 ff.=*B.D.* i. 162 ff.

ways of telling a conscious lie. The passage in Pārājika IV as it goes on is paralleled by a passage in Pāc. VIII. In both Pārājika IV on the one hand and Pāc. I and VIII on the other, this analysis with its very different style and terminology consorts strangely with the more archaic language and the more direct modes of thought that we usually associate with the *Vinaya*.

(5) Pāc. II and LI contain material belonging to *Jātaka* stories—but so does Pāc. V.

(6) As already noted, there is the failure of the Old Commentary on Pāc. XI to explain one of the two key-words of the rule: " in destruction of," *pātabyatāya*.

(7) Pāc. XII, with its mention in the introductory story of Channa, who, having indulged in bad habits, *anācāraṃ ācaritvā*, was being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, to my mind brings the whole question of monastic disciplinary regulation a step later in time. For it points to a period when formal proceedings had been constituted, when faults were examined, not merely expiated by confession, and when there was an apparatus for dealing with, among many other transgressions, questions of failure in habit or conduct, *ācāravipatti*. These are set out in detail in *CV*, IV. This Pācittiya, in striking contrast to Saṅgh. XII, where again the same fault is imputed to Channa, seems to have been compiled in full cognisance of these later legal proceedings.

(8) Pāc. XIII appears to be recording an event later in time than that recorded in Saṅgh. VIII. In this latter, Dabba the Mallian is appointed, so it is said, to the double office of assigning lodgings and distributing meals. Between this and the compilation of the Pācittiya some time must have elapsed, since in the Pācittiya he is being accused of acting out of favouritism. The Old Commentary mentions a number of offices tenable by members of the Order, showing that it knew of the creation of these. It does not mention all. So far we know little of the chronology of these offices, but it is unlikely that they were formed during the earliest days of the Sakyan venture.

(9) Now, in Pārājika III, the gist of the offence lies in intentionally depriving a person of life. The case is cited, in the stories given *after* the formulation of the rule, of one monk tickling another, who laughed so much that he died. It is here not said openly that this constitutes an offence, merely that it is not one involving defeat, because his death was not caused intentionally. Either some need to clarify the nature of this offence must have grown up, for in Pāc. LII the same story is recounted and entails an offence of expiation; or the nature of the offence was decided contemporaneously with the Pārājika story, but, being *pācittiya*, was reserved for the Pācittiya group of rules and offences. If this is the case here, it is otherwise with Pārājika II. For this now and again states that an offence of deliberate lying may not be such as to constitute an offence of defeat, although it may be one involving expiation (*Vin.* iii. 59, 66).

(10) Pāc. LIII seems to offer little data as to its comparative age. It is unusual, however, in that no verbal reports of unsuitable behaviour are recorded to reach the lord. The framing of the rule is made to depend upon Pasenadi's belief that his "device" will arouse the required suspicions in Gotama's mind.

(11) The rule framed in Pāc. LIV, that "in disrespect there is an offence of expiation," is not unique. Three times a similar *pācittiya* offence is laid down at *Vin.* i. 176, in connection with the elaborate arrangements made there for holding the Pavāraṇā ceremony. Such Pācittiyas are therefore part and parcel of large-scale administration and regulation, such as could only be undertaken when the Order was comparatively advanced in age and stability. But who can say whether the rule at Pāc. LIV is based on these other *anādariye pācittiyas*, or they on it, or whether they are independent? All one can say is that it is not at all necessary to suppose that the bad habits that again Channa is recorded to have indulged in had anything to do with preparations for the Pavāraṇā.

For a long list of "bad habits," quite unconnected with this, is given at Saṅghâdisesa XIII.

If the evidence of the Pācittiyas which are briefly stated and stand at the head of three only out of the eight divisions of which the Pācittiya section is composed, appears to be on the side of their comparative lateness, it must be not forgotten that the remaining Pācittiyas have never been subjected to any kind of critical examination. When this has been undertaken, it may be found that some of them also, although their rules are framed in the more normal manner, show similar or different signs of comparatively late construction. What I have done here is no more than to indicate possible lines which historical inquiry into the comparative age of different parts of the *Vinaya* might follow.

In discussing these "brief" Pācittiyas, I have had occasion to mention the overlapping of Pārājika and Pācittiya material. I have cited Pārājika IV and Pācittiya VIII, and these are also seen to work in with one another in a still further fashion. In the former it is an offence involving defeat for a monk, out of undue estimate for himself, to boast that he has attained some state of "further-men," when this is not a fact, *abhūta*. In the latter it is an offence of expiation for a monk to speak of attaining such a state to anyone not ordained, even though it be a fact, *bhūta*. In both cases the introductory story is identical up to this point, although Pār. IV, before the final draft of the rule, adds material not appearing in Pāc. VIII. This same long story with the two endings may in fact be the record of no more than one event, some monks averring that they had told a lie, others maintaining that they had told the truth. If so, Pār. IV and Pāc. VIII would belong to precisely the same date, suggesting that the two cases were legislated for simultaneously, although the two findings were relegated to different but appropriate parts of the Pātimokkha.

Judging by the great length of Pārājika IV, and the number of cases adduced and legislated for, the topic

was one that was at some time of immense importance.[1] It is not therefore surprising that it figures also in the Pācittiya section. It suggests, as does the substance of no other rules at all, the spiritual value attached to a man becoming something more and greater than he was before.

There are still further occasions when the contents of this volume refer to different portions of the *Vinaya* or are referred to by it. Under the latter heading come also certain allusions which are generally wrapped up in the phrase, *yathādhammo kāretabbo*, he should be dealt with according to the rule—that is, according to some Nissaggiya or Pācittiya rule. This indicates that such a rule had been formulated before that portion of the *Vinaya* referring to it had been compiled. I have drawn attention, in the notes, to any references that I have found in the contents of this volume to or from other parts of the *Vinaya*.

Another Pācittiya which betrays the marks of some later accretion is No. XXIX. In it there is a list of eleven persons who, for a householder, were elders, *therā*, and whom he invited to a meal. It is an interesting list. It contains the names of nine out of the ten to twelve men whom Mrs. Rhys Davids considers were at the beginning of his ministry "clustering about the Leader in the Vinaya."[2] Two therefore look like intruders into this early company: Upāli, "the Vinaya expert"[3]—but expert only on the assumption that by his day the discipline had had time to grow into some coherent form; and Rāhula, the founder's son. He was probably not among his father's followers from the very beginning of his teaching, and was never a particularly satisfactory monk, although several earnest discourses were addressed to him.[4]

---

[1] *B.D.* i. xxiv f.

[2] *Sakya*, p. 127. For further information on these early followers see *Gotama the Man*, Ch. VI, and *Sakya*, Ch. VII.

[3] *Sakya*, p. 352.

[4] *M.* Stas. 61, 62, 147.

Members of Other Sects.—This volume contains some interesting details about the *titthiyas*, especially, as is natural, regarding ways in which their life and that of the Sakyan followers might overlap.

(1) In Nissaggiya XXII, people, jumping from the particular to the general, complained that the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, went about for almsfood to be put into their hands, like members of other sects.

(2) In Nissaggiya VI, monks coming "naked as they were" to Sāvatthī were mistaken by their co-religionists for *ājīvaka*, Naked Ascetics.[1]

(3) In Pācittiya I, Hatthaka, a monk, having been outwitted in an argument by members of other sects, *titthiyas*, resorted to unworthy methods in order to confound them. The *titthiyas* complained, and not in vain, for the modest monks heard them and asked Hatthaka if there was truth in what they had been saying. He seems to have been very cross, saying that somehow the *titthiyas* should be worsted. But the modest monks were not impressed by this declaration, and told the incident to the lord. The result was what is now the first *pācittiya* rule. This story merely confirms what is well known: that monks and *titthiyas* debated together, and that, whatever individual monks might do or think, the considered opinion of the *saṁgha* was that *titthiyas* should not be treated contemptuously.

(4) Pācittiya XXXII. 8 supplies various items of interest. To begin with there is the *ājīvaka* who wanted to provide "a meal for all heretics," *sabbapasaṇḍikabhatta*. This shows that he thought of those who were not of his sect, although they were following a life of religion, as "heretics"; at the same time he wished to honour them by entertaining them. In accordance with this view, or so it seems, the *ājīvaka* was advised by King Bimbisāra, a relation of his, first of all to invite Gotama and his monks. He sent a messenger to the monks; but they refused the invitation, for at that time a group-meal of this nature had not been allowed. The

[1] Lit. Men of the Livelihood, *Bud. Ind.*, p. 143.

naked ascetic then approached Gotama, whom he greeted in an amicable and friendly way, and argued that one who is gone forth, *pabbajita*, is fit or worthy, *arahati*, to accept the alms of another who is gone forth. Gotama then, as recorded, accepted, and allowed the monks to eat a group-meal at the meal-time of recluses, *samaṇa-bhatta-samaya*. Here, as not infrequently, the terms of the rule are wider than the terms used in the story leading up to its formulation. *Samaṇa* was a word of very general application, covering *ājīvaka*, as well as members of all other diverse and "heretical" sects. In the Old Commentary, *samaṇa* is defined as *paribbājaka-samāpanna*, lit. one who has attained to being a wanderer. *Paribbājaka*[1] was, like *samaṇa*, a word of tremendous range, although it did not, for members of Gotama's Order themselves, include "monk" or "nun." For,

(5) In Pācittiya XLI (= *Vin.* iv. 285, and *cf.* iv. 224), wanderer and female wanderer are, taking their definitions in conjunction, explained as, "setting aside monk and novice, nun, female probationer and female novice, whoever (else) has attained to being a (male or female) wanderer." It is only regrettable that the definition contains the word to be defined. In this portion of the Old Commentary too, Naked Ascetic, here and also in the rule called *acelaka*,[2] although he figured in the story as an *ājīvaka*, is defined as "whoever, naked, has attained to being a wanderer." This definition should be compared with that of *samaṇa* in Pācittiya XXXII.

Pācittiya XLI further tells that a monk gave almsfood,

[1] The account of *paribbājakā* at *Bud. Ind.*, p. 141, has not been superseded.

[2] He who is without a cloth, *cela*. Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, ii. xxx-xxxi, says that "the Buddhists denote by Acelaka the followers of Makkhali Gosāla and his two predecessors, Kisa Saṃkicca and Nanda Vaccha, and have preserved an account of their religious practices in the Majjhima Nikāya, 36." Jacobi draws attention to the identity of the rules for the *acelakas* and the Jains. Gosāla's views are set forth at *D.* i. 53. *Dial.* i. 71, n. 1, calls his followers *ājīvaka*. B. M. Barua, *The Ājīvakas*, Pt. i., p. 13, summarises the position thus: "Both the Jaina and Buddhist records agree in speaking of Gosāla as a leader of the Ājīvaka sect. . . . They also agree in calling the Ājīvakas naked ascetics (*acelakas*)."

at a distribution of food, to an *ājīvaka.* All that the *ājīvaka* seems to have done by way of thanks was to tell his fellow sectarians that the food was obtained by him from a *muṇḍagahapatika* belonging to Gotama, the recluse, *samaṇa.* This curious term, possibly unique to this context, is clearly one of contempt. It means literally "little shaven householder", and would seem to imply that the *ājīvakas* despised the monks for their less austere way of living, and were not above having a sly dig at their more indulgent tendencies.

People who heard what the *ājīvaka* had said are recorded to advise the lord not to let monks, whom they call *ayya,* masters, give with their own hands to *titthiyas,* since these want to bring discredit on the buddha, the dhamma and the Order.

Three points emerge from this episode with the lay-people. First, that *ājīvakas* did not live, any more than did monks, either in seclusion from the "world" or from members of other sects, including Gotama's. Secondly, that the lay-people appear to have come to the conclusion that their representations to the lord must include more than the one sect of the *ājīvakas,* and they therefore say *titthiyas,* a term of broader application. Thirdly, that the odd intrusion of the later "triad of Buddhism" may suggest that this passage belongs to a comparatively late date, but that then, with the increasing popularity of Gotama's Order, relations between Sakyan monks and followers of other sects were becoming somewhat strained.

This Pācittiya, rich in its references to members of other sects, contains yet one more. Gotama is reputed to tell Ānanda to give what surplus there is of the Order's solid food to "those who eat scraps," broken meats, or remains of food, *vighāsāda.* Ānanda, always showing a touching regard for women, chose as the recipients some female wanderers, *paribbājikā.* Here then is contributory evidence that wanderers were eaters of scraps, of food not otherwise wanted, and that they did not object to receiving this from Gotama's religious followers.

(6) In Nissaggiya XX a wanderer, *paribbājaka*, is recorded to barter his costly cloth for Upananda's outer cloak, but when he wanted to exchange the articles again Upananda refused. The wanderer complained, basing his argument on the life of the world: because householders give out of compassion to another householder, should not one who has gone forth, *pabbajita*, give to one who has gone forth? The resemblance to the *ājīvaka's* reasoning in Pāc. XXXII. 8 cited above is quite remarkable. Upananda is rebuked both by other monks and by Gotama for bartering with a wanderer. The wanderer's park or monastery, *ārāma*, is mentioned.[1]

Sakyaputta.—In this volume there are two monks who have appended to their name the epithet Sakyaputta. These are Upananda Sakyaputta, to whom there are frequent references—*e.g.*, Nis. VI, VIII-X, XVIII, XX, XXV, XXVII, Pāc. IX, XLII-XLVI, LIX, and Hatthaka Sakyaputta, Pāc. I. This epithet, which I have translated as "son of the Sakyans," was presumably given to distinguish these men from others bearing the same name. Neither Upananda nor Hatthaka was an ornament to the Order, and thus the epithet will not have been conferred in recognition of any special ability on his part. It indicated primarily that they were Sakyans, born into the Sakyan clan or tribe, *gotta*. But it did more than this. It implied, not only that the men so described were of Sakyan descent and themselves Sakyans, but that they were also members of the religious sect known by its contemporaries as the Sakyaputta sect, its adherents being called *sakyaputtiyas*.

For Sakyans who were not monks are called, when there was need to differentiate them from others of the same name, not Sakyaputta, but Sakka. A good example is Mahānāma Sakka (Pāc. XLVII and, *e.g.*, *A*. i. 26, 276), a brother of Anuruddha and cousin of

[1] See *Bud. India*, p. 142.

Gotama. There does not seem to have been any other notable Anuruddha contemporary with this brother of Mahānāma's, and so there was no occasion to append Sakka to his name. There were however other Mahānāmas,[1] hence the suffix Sakka for the one of Sakyan descent.

I hold it essential to translate the *putta* in Sakyaputta. Yet in saying that a Sakyan who had become a follower of Gotama's was called Sakyaputta if his own name was not sufficiently distinctive, I do not in the least wish to suggest anything mystical or comparable to the Hindu "twice born." No more is meant than the recording of the case of a Sakyan who had become a follower of the Sakyaputta sect, or, after the Order had been fully constituted, a monk in Gotama's Order. In this way, the force of *putta* in *Sakyaputta* is double-edged. It indicates at one and the same time a man's birth as Sakyan and his calling as religious. Moreover, the fact is emphasised that the sectarian or monastic body which he has entered is one founded by his kinsman, a member of his own clan, Gotama Sakyaputta, as he is called by members of other sects,[2] and by Assaji, recently become a follower.[3]

In its beginnings, the sect founded by Gotama, and which afterwards turned into an "Order,"[4] was largely entered and maintained by his relations. I therefore think it advisable, in order to keep before the mind the Sakyan and not merely Gotamic influences on the origin of the monastic institution, to translate the *Sakya* part of the compound *Sakyaputta* as "of the Sakyans," using the plural. The same will apply to *Sakyaputtiyo*, "sons of the Sakyans," a name frequently given to Gotama's followers, whether they were of the Sakyan clan or not. By their calling, and not on account of their birth, these had become "sons" of the Sakyan leader,

[1] See *D.P.P.N.* [2] *E.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 1.

[3] *Vin.* i. 41. Assaji is recorded to refer to Gotama as *mahāsamaṇo Sakyaputto Sakyakulā pabbajito*, the great recluse, the son of the Sakyans, gone forth from a Sakyan family.

[4] See S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, Ch. III.

Sakyamuni,[1] and of his Sakyan co-workers and co-founders.[2]

There is a commentarial support for taking the *Sakya* of the compound as a plural. For *VA*. 735 defines *Sakyaputta* as *Sakyānaṃ putto*, "son of the Sakyans," *Sakyānaṃ* being a genitive plural.

It is perhaps not always necessary, although I hold it to be correct, to insert "son," *putta*, in translations of various compounds, such as *devaputta* (*e.g.*, *A*. i. 278, Hatthaka *devaputta*) and Mallaputta (*e.g.*, Dabba Mallaputta, *Vin*. iii. 158, iv. 37), it being sufficient to read merely a, or the, *deva*, and a, or the, Mallian.

But when a person can only be distinguished from others bearing the same name by calling him "so and so, the son of so and so," as Upasena Vaṅgantaputta,[3] then the *putta* part of the name must be translated. For he was not Upasena Vaṅganta, but Upasena, Vaṅganta's son. The great exception to this is Sāriputta, where, for English translators and readers, *putta* seems to have become an integral part of his name, since it is never translated as "the son of (Rūpa-)Sārī."

As *putta* sometimes forms part of a name, so also does *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā*, mother, father, daughter. For example, there are Sigālamātā, Nakulamātā, Visākhā Migāramātā, Nakulapitā, Suppavāsā Koḷiyadhītā. Now Nakulamātā and Nakulapitā have, in the Pali canon, no other names. They must therefore be translated as "Nakula's mother" and "Nakula's father." I think it as necessary to translate *putta* where it means a "son" in a life of religion, as it is to translate *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā* and again *putta* where no such reference is intended.

There are further the terms *ayya* and *ayyaputta*;

[1] E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha*, p. 1, n. 1, "Śākyamuni, 'the sage of the Śakyas'"; *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 150, "Śākyamuni, 'the recluse of the Śākyas'"; S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, i. 351, "Śākyamuni, the sage of the Śākyas."

[2] Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Gotama the Man*, p. 89 ff.; *Sakya*, p. 115 ff.; and *cf. Unknown Co-founders of Buddhism*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1927, p. 193 ff.

[3] See below, p. 83.

these cannot mean exactly the same thing. The former is " master " and the latter " little master," something like our " son of the house," the young gentleman. Again there is *seṭṭhi* and *seṭṭhiputta.* The former is variously translated as banker, merchant, great merchant, treasurer. A difference in standing is, I hold, intended by *seṭṭhiputta* (see Nissag. VI), and should be shown in translations. A *seṭṭhiputta* is a young merchant, literally a son of a merchant, but he is not yet the head of the firm, for his description as *putta* means that his father is still alive. It would not be actually wrong to translate *seṭṭhiputta* as " merchant," since he is one by occupation, but the full significance implicit in *putta* can only be brought out by regarding the word as pithy, not as pleonastic. In the same way I think that the intended implication of *putta,* when the poor workman addresses Kirapatika, in Pāc. XXXIII, as *ayyaputta,* is that this employer, although paying the wages, was not the head of his business because his father was still living.

Dhammī kathā and *dhamma.*—I have translated *dhammī kathā* often as " reasoned talk," sometimes as " talk on dhamma." In so doing, I have been guided mainly by the context. I hold that in the phrase, " then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given *dhammī kathā,* addressed the monks, saying," the lord is not supposed to have given them talk on *dhamma,* on material now found chiefly in the Suttas. I think it more probable that he was engaged in explaining to the monks such circumstances as had arisen since the first framing of a rule, and telling them why he thought its alteration justifiable. He would thus have been reasoning out the situation with them, marshalling the arguments bearing on the case.

Similarly, Gotama is sometimes shown, for example in Nis. III and Pāc. LVIII, as questioning monks or hearing reports about their conduct. Then, it is said, " having given *dhammī kathā,*" he framed a rule so that, given certain circumstances, they need not behave in

that particular way again. In this connection Pāc. LVIII is interesting, for it asserts that the *dhammī kathā* given was "on what is befitting, on what is suitable." These words, (*an-*)*anulomika* and (*an-*)*anucchavika*, do not properly belong to Sutta but to *Vinaya* material. When they occur in the Suttas,[1] it seems uniformly the case that they are used in connection with the discipline of monks or other *samaṇas*.

On the other hand, when it is said, for example in Pāc. VI, that Anuruddha roused and delighted the woman *dhammiyā kathāya*, it would be a mistake to think that he was explaining to her the need for making or altering a rule. The context in no way suggests this; it suggests that he had given her an inspiring talk in virtue of which she became a lay-adherent.

Again, to take from among many other instances of it, the phrase as it stands in Pāc. XXI. From the context it may be inferred that Gotama gave the nuns some lofty discourse to recompense their disappointment for "the merely inferior talk on dhamma," *parittañ ñeva dhammiṃ kathaṃ katvā*, given them by the group of six monks in place of the exhortation.[2]

Lest it be thought that in the Nissaggiyas and these Pācittiyas the phrase *dhammī kathā* supplants *dhamma*, it will be wise to draw attention to some of the passages where this great word occurs. In Pāc. IV, the group of six monks are found making lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line. This was made an offence. The Old Commentary on this Pācittiya, as well as that on Pāc. VII, by its choice of words for defining *dhamma*, makes it clear that *dhamma* as the teaching, as discourses, as great sayings, as connected with the goal, *attha*, was being considered; and neither *dhamma* as *dhammī kathā*, reasoned talk germane to the matter in hand, nor *dhamma* as *pāḷi*, the text, as it is explained

---

[1] *E.g.*, *A.* i. 106, ii. 27, iii. 116; *M.* i. 477; *It.* 103; *Sn.* 385.

[2] *Cf.* *M.* iii. 270, where Mahāpajāpatī is shown asking Gotama for exhortation, for instruction, for *dhammikathā*, "talk on dhamma," for the nuns.

in Bu.'s commentary.[1] Pāc. VII traces the evolution of the circumstances in which it became permissible for a monk to teach dhamma, *dhammaṃ deseti*, to women. Pāc. V confines itself to mentioning that lay-followers listened to *dhamma* spoken by, *bhāsita*, monks who were elders. This would be in accordance with part of the definition given by the Old Commentary on Pāc. IV and VII, that *dhamma* is what is spoken by disciples.

Dhamma, for the reason stated in the Introduction to vol. i., I have left untranslated.[2]

Ārāma; *vihāra*.—I have usually translated *ārāma*, not as "park," but as "monastery"; and *vihāra* as "dwelling-place."[3] The *Vinaya* depicts monastic life at a fairly advanced stage, and it is reasonable to assume that the many words connected with the monks' lodgings had attained definite meanings reflecting the habits and customs induced by their way of living.

Ārāmas were doubtless originally places for enjoyment, parks. Many were handed over by rich benefactors to the Order as it grew and its increasing numbers called for larger and more fixed settlements. *Ārāmas* thus became monasteries, places made use of by monks, and intended solely for this purpose.

Vihāras too, as the monks increased in number, changed their character. The word had at some time stood for something much like an isolated *pariveṇa*, or cell, but it came to imply a row of cells, or individual dwelling-places, connected by a verandah, *pamukha*.[4]

It is curious and disappointing that the definition of *vihāra* in Pāc. XIX and at *Vin*. iii. 156 is so unenlightening. Neither is the word explained where other comparable terms are briefly defined in Pārājika II.[5]

H. Kern[6] has to my mind given an acceptable, though short, account of *ārāma*, *vihāra*, *pariveṇa* and *kuṭī* (hut);

[1] For Bu.'s interpretations of the words used in defining *dhamma*, see *VA*. 742, and below, p. 191.

[2] *B.D.* i. lvi.

[3] For notes on these terms, see below, pp. 2, 46.

[4] *Cf.* Pāc. XVII. 2, 1.

[5] See *B.D.* i. 83.

[6] *Man. Ind. Buddhism*, p. 80 ff.

and S. Dutt has a learned and illuminating chapter[1] on the development, interrelation and use of these quarters for monks, together with the function and character of such other words denoting habitations for monks as *sīmā*, boundary, limit; *āvāsa*, residence, settlement, colony; and *senâsana*, lodgings, bedding, " seats." S. Dutt shows, in this chapter, that as " the communal life of the Bhikkhus came to gravitate more and more towards a cœnobium," largely " brought about by the institutions of Vassa," the rains-retreat, so there developed the means and the rules for communal, as against eremitical, dwelling.

Ekamantaṃ.—The literal meaning of this is " at one side." The word constantly occurs in the phrases, " he, or she, stood, or sat down at one side." This implies respect accorded to a superior. In order to bring out this aspect of *ekamantaṃ*, of the respectful attitude adopted by laity towards monks, by monks to senior monks or to wiser monks, I have translated the word as " at a respectful distance." In so doing, I am following the Commentaries. These enumerate six wrong ways of sitting, *nisajjadosa*,[2] such as would bring discomfort and inconvenience to a person worthy of consideration and honour. The only reason why I prefer my translation to the more literal one is that it better emphasises a particular point in the manners of the day; and also when we hear of lay-people sitting down or standing by monks " at a respectful distance," one more piece of evidence, however small, testifying to the esteem in which monks were held by the laity, is forced to contribute its weight.

Abbhantara.—This is a linear measure, mentioned below on pp. 20, 22, and which I have left untranslated for fear lest an English rendering should give a false impression.[3]

---

[1] *Early Bud. Monachism*, Ch. V.

[2] See below, p. 42, n. 5.

[3] See *B.D.* i., p. lviii.

Bu.'s Commentary[1] remarks that "here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands (*hattha*)"; the *C.P.D.* says no more than that it is "a certain measure of length." The *Vibhaṅga* Commentary does not include *abbhantara* among its graded linear measurements at all.[2] In Moggallāna's scheme of measures of length,[3] although given at the very end of the scheme and looking like an afterthought, we find that twenty-eight *ratanas* equal one *abbhantara*. Rhys Davids,[4] following this scheme, describes *ratana* as "(cubit, forearm) = hattha = kukku," and says that *hattha* "is the usual word."[5] The *Saṃyutta* Commentary explains *kukku* by *hattha*.[6] As it is very likely that these measurements varied with time and locality, in trying to establish the length of a *Vinaya abbhantara* it will be best to consider the *hattha*, twenty-eight of which were held to compose an *abbhantara*, according to *Vinaya* interpretations.

We find *hattha* defined in the Old Commentary[7] as "from the elbow as far as the tip of the nail," which means that *hattha*, taken as a measure of length, would comprise the hand together with the forearm.[8] Even so, there is yet some vagueness, for the tips of the nails are not all the same distance from the elbow. We are thus left with not an exact measurement. Rhys Davids however suggested that "to the end of the *little* finger only is meant,"[9] apparently on the grounds that because the span, *vidatthi*, is the basis of computation for the *ratana*, two *vidatthi* making one *ratana*, and because *vidatthi* is "the name for the ordinary span to the end of the fourth or little finger" from the end of the thumb, therefore the *hattha*, which is equivalent to the *ratana* measure, would be from the elbow as far as the nail of the little finger. This provides a straight line for measurement, and the distance is about fifteen inches. One *abbhantara*, if taken as equal to twenty-eight *hatthas*, would therefore correspond to roughly

[1] *VA*. 654. [2] *VbhA*. 343. [3] *Abhp*. 194-7.
[4] *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 15. [5] *Op. cit., loc. cit.*, n. 2.
[6] *SA*. iii. 300. [7] *Vin*. iii. 121, iv. 221.
[8] *Cf. VA*. 533. [9] *Ancient Coins, etc.*, pp. 15, 17.

thirty-five feet. The "staff" in Sekhiya **58** (*Vin.* iv. 200), that had to measure "four hands," would be about five feet in length.

In conclusion, I very gratefully acknowledge my debt to Mrs. Rhys Davids for her unflagging interest in the preparation of this volume, and for kindly reading the proofs. Two revered *theras* of Colombo, the Venerable Rambukwella Siddhartha and the Venerable S. P. Vajiranana, have given me much valuable assistance with monastic practice and *Vinaya* terminology.

To these in particular, and also to other friends and acquaintances in Ceylon, too numerous to mention, I would tender my warm thanks in recognition of conversations that were as instructive as they were stimulating. I am also indebted to the editor for his kind permission to reprint in this Introduction part of an article published in 1939 in the Vesak Number of the *Ceylon Daily News*.

I. B. HORNER.

MANCHESTER, 1940.

CONTENTS

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME II.

Vinayapiṭaka

SUTTAVIBHAṄGA (NISSAGGIYA)

[These thirty rules, venerable ones, for offences of expiation involving forfeiture, come up for recitation.]

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) I

AT one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Vesālī in the Gotamaka shrine.[1] At that time three robes were allowed to monks by the lord.[2] The

---

[1] *Gotamaka-cetiya*, one of the *cetiyas* or shrines of Vesālī, to the south (*D.* iii. 9). Mentioned, with the other shrines of Vesālī, as being pleasant (*D.* ii. 102-3, 118; *A.* iv. 309; *S.* v. 159; *Ud.* 62). *AA.* ii. 373 ascribes the Gotamaka-cetiya to a *yakkha* named Gotamaka. For further references to these shrines see *UdA.* 322-3; *Dial.* i. 220 ff.; *K.S.* v. 230, 231; Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Gotama the Man*, 193; E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, 137; B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, 46, and Appendix; and *D.P.P.N.*

[2] The three robes, *ticīvara*, consisted of the inner robe or cloth, *antaravāsaka*, the upper robe or cloth, *uttarāsaṅga*, the outer cloak, *saṅghāṭi*. Permission to wear a double, *diguṇa*, outer cloak, a single, *ekacciya*, upper robe, and a single inner robe is given at *Vin.* i. 289, also at the Gotamaka shrine. At *Vin. Texts* ii. 212, n. 2, the three robes are described in detail, although there the *saṅghāṭi* is wrongly called the " waist cloth."

The *antaravāsaka* is put on at the waist, and hangs down to just above the ankles, being tied with the *kāyabandhana*, a strip of cloth made into a belt or girdle (allowed at *Vin.* ii. 136). The method of putting on the *antaravāsaka* is different from that adopted by laymen, *Vin.* ii. 137. Monks take the two ends together, fold them across together in front and then fold them back again; then the garment is held in position by the belt. The *uttarāsaṅga* is the upper robe worn when a monk is in a residence. It covers him from neck to ankle, leaving one shoulder bare; it should not be worn

group[1] of six monks, thinking: "Three robes are allowed by the lord," entered a village in one set of robes, remained in the monastery[2] in another set of three robes, went down to bathe in another set of three robes. Those who were modest monks looked down upon,[3] criticised,[4] spread it about,[5] saying: "How can the group of six monks wear an extra robe?"[6] Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you wear an extra robe?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

---

in the same way as laymen wear their upper cloth, *Vin.* ii. 137. The *saṅghāṭi* is put on over this when the monk goes out. It may be exactly the same size as the *uttarāsaṅga*, but it consists of double cloth, since to make it two robes are woven together. It is a good protection against cold, and monks may wrap themselves in it to sleep. All these three robes are made in the patchwork fashion. Only the bathing-cloth is plain.

[1] To end of || 1 || below, *cf. Vin.* i. 289, where the sixfold group is again recorded as offending in this way. There a reference to this Nissag. rule is implied, for it is said that monks should not wear an extra robe, and whoever does so should be dealt with *yathādhammo*, according to the rule.

[2] *ārāma*, a park, a place where one enjoys oneself, *ā+ramati*. *Cf.* definition of *ārāma* at *Vin.* iii. 49 as *pupphârāma phalârāma*, flower-park, fruit-park (orchard). In Pali, however, the word has come to be used largely in connection with a residence for monks, hence a monastery.

[3] *ujjhāyanti*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *avajjhāyanti avajānantā taṃ jhāyanti olokenti, lāmakato vā cintentî ti attho*, they censured, despising, they were angry, (and) looked down upon him, or the meaning is they thought (of him) as inferior. *Cf. VA.* 770 (*ujjhāpeti*) and *SA.* i. 349. *Ujjhāyati* therefore seems to mean to think poorly of, to look down upon, to belittle someone, rather than to be irritated, angry, or to grumble. *Cf. Pāc.* 13, *Vin.* iv. 38.

[4] *khīyanti*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *tassa avaṇṇaṃ kathenti pakāsenti*, they speak blame (dispraise) of him, they show him up. *Cf. SA.* i. 349. Hence to speak badly of someone, to criticise. *Cf. Pāc.* 13, *Vin.* iv. 38, *Pāc.* 79, *Vin.* iv. 152, *Pāc.* 81, *Vin.* iv. 154.

[5] *vipācenti*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *vitthārikaṃ karonti sabbattha pattharanti*, they make wide-spread, they spread everywhere. Hence to speak disparagingly, to spread ill-fame. *Cf. SA.* i. 349. These three words occur frequently in *Vin.*, but only once I think otherwise in the Canon, at *S.* i. 232.

[6] *atirekacīvara*.

"How can you, foolish men, wear an extra robe? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased[1] . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training[2] should be set forth:

Whatever monk should wear an extra robe, there is an offence[3] of expiation[4] involving forfeiture."[5]

---

[1] *appasannānaṃ pasādāya. Pasāda, prasāda* (Skrt.) is "pleasing." *Cf. buddhe pasannā* of *S.* i. 34, pleased with the Buddha, and therefore become his followers, *i.e.* converted. Thus "pleasing" has the sense of "converting."

[2] *sikkhāpada. Pada* is a sentence, rule, regulation, ordinance, which indicates a training. Here *pada* is rule; *sikkhā* is training. Hence a rule of, or for, training.

[3] Although no word for "offence" occurs in these rules, the terms themselves—*e.g. pācittiya, dukkaṭa*—imply "offence."

[4] *pācittiya.* E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 18, n. 3, says that "this translation depends on the derivation of *pācittiya* from Sanskrit *prāyaścittika*, but this is not the term used in the Sanskrit versions of the Pātimokkha, which have *pātayantika* and *pāyantika*." *Vin. Texts* i. 32 and Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache* § 27, incline to etymology *prāyaścittika*. Geiger points out that Sylvain Lévi derives it from *prāk-citta* which +*ika* is the derivation to which the *P.E.D.* inclines. *Pācittiya* as *prāyaścittika* means lit. "in repentance, in compensation, in expiation." Expiation is not, however, enjoined in these rules, but confession. Thus in reality *pācittiya* means a (minor) offence to be confessed. But since the term *pācittiya* has etymologically nothing to do with confession, I have kept to the more literal rendering of "expiation." B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.*, i. 46 ff., speaks of Pācittiya offences as those "for which some expiation was laid down . . . requiring repentance . . . requiring confession and absolution."

At *Vin.* i. 254 five things are allowed to the monks after the ceremonial making of the kaṭhina cloth, one being to have as many robes as are wanted. This appears to be a relaxation of the above rule.

[5] *nissaggiya.* The thing to be forfeited or given up was that in respect of which the offence had been committed.

The name of this class of offence, Nissaggiya Pācittiya, means that, besides confessing the offence, there is an object wrongfully acquired which has to be forfeited. In the next class of offence, Pācittiya, there is no such object which needs to be forfeited. To mark the distinction between these two classes of offence (Nissaggiya Pācittiya, and Pācittiya), as also their connection, in translating *nissaggiya pācittiya* I have put *nissaggiya*, "involving forfeiture," in the secondary position, although in the Pali it stands before *pācittiya*.

Thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down[1] by the lord. || **1** ||

At that time[2] an extra robe accrued to[3] the venerable Ānanda; and the venerable Ānanda was desirous of giving that robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: " A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra robe should not be worn. And this extra robe has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable [**195**] Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

" But, Ānanda, how long before Sāriputta will come (here)?"

" Lord, on the ninth or tenth day," he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk,[4] addressed the monks, saying:

" Monks, I allow you to wear an extra robe for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled,[5] when a monk's[6]

---

[1] *paññatta*. The primary sense, "made known," is now lost. The word is now used in its secondary sense of established, given, passed, laid down.

[2] =*Vin.* i. 289. Also *cf.* below, Nissag. XXI, where the same story is told in the same words about an extra bowl.

[3] *uppannaṃ hoti*, lit. there came to be arisen to, produced for, or born to. *Cf.* below, pp. 24, 90, 99, 114.

[4] *dhammī kathā*. In this and similar contexts this does not mean talk on *dhamma*, on the doctrine as expounded in the Suttas, so much as any good, reasonable talk relevant to the matter in hand. Thus here the lord, it may be supposed, would have reasoned with the monks and have explained to them the causes and conditions leading him to modify the rule as originally laid down. *Cf. VA.* 637.

[5] *niṭṭhita*, established, closed, settled, finished, ready to wear, or "done for." For this last see *Vin. Texts* i. 19 in note. That *niṭṭhita* has the two meanings of "made" and "done for" is borne out by the Old Comy. Huber, *J.As.* 1913, Nov.-Dec., p. 490, has " si un bhikṣu a les trois robes au complet," and doubtless the meaning here is that the robes have been distributed and each monk has his set of three robes made up and ready to wear.

[6] *bhikkhunā*, instrumental used for genitive.

kaṭhina[1] (privileges)[2] have been removed,[3] an extra robe may be worn for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 ||

---

[1] The kaṭhina cloth is the cotton cloth supplied annually, after the rains, by the laity to the monks for making robes. Kaṭhina refers to a specially ceremonial cloth, for it is made with special ceremony at the end of the rains. The kaṭhina cloth should be brought at dawn, offered to the Order, cut by the monks, sewn and dyed. All this must be done on the same day. Then it is taken to a *sīmā*, boundary, and with formulæ is offered by the Order to one monk. Ways in which kaṭhina comes to be made, *atthata*, and not made, *anatthata*, are given at *Vin.* i. 254 f. The kaṭhina cloth brings certain privileges, which, however, last only four months. It loses its quality automatically at the end of the season, as well as in other ways. A monk can wear kaṭhina cloth for any length of days as long as the kaṭhina quality is there. If it is not kaṭhina cloth, he can wear an extra robe for only ten days. On *atthata* *cf.* also below, p. 26, n. 3.

[2] Five things were allowable to monks when the kaṭhina cloth had been (formally) made, *atthata*, *Vin.* i. 254.

[3] *ubbhatasmiṃ kaṭhine*; sometimes *ubbhāra-* or *uddhāra-*. On these phrases see *Vin. Texts* i. 18, n., for a most interesting though tentative account of the usages connected with the robes. Also *Vin. Texts* ii. 148, n., 157, n. Huber, *J.As.*, 1913, Nov.-Dec., p. 490, renders "et qu'il ait pris le kaṭhina"; Gogerly, *J.R.A.S.*, 1862, p. 431, "and the kaṭhina (or cloth for the purpose) has been consecrated"; Dickson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1876, p. 105, "when the kaṭhina period has expired"; Rhys Davids, *Vin. Texts* i. 18, "when the kaṭhina has been taken up by the bhikkhu"; *Vin. Texts* ii. 157, "suspension of the kaṭhina privileges" (for *kaṭhinubbhāra*); B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 52, "after the performance of the kaṭhina ceremony."

For the eight grounds for removing the five kaṭhina "privileges" —*i.e.*, the five things that are allowable after the kaṭhina cloth is made—see *Vin.* i. 255 ff. According to Old Comy., see below, they may also be removed before the time by the Order. The ceremony of making and distributing the kaṭhina cloth (see above, p. 5, n. 1) took place after the rains, *Vin.* i. 254, and it was seen to that each monk had three robes. These, though worn by him, were the property of the Order. He might not need three new ones every season. However, it might happen that, through dampness or other causes, his three robes were not ready to wear, or he might be going to another residence (see the *palibodha* and *apalibodha* at *Vin.* i. 265), and then he might take (temporarily) an extra robe. Thus for this period the rule as to the three robes was relaxed, and an extra robe might be worn, but not for more than ten days.

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up[1] for a monk, or lost[2] or destroyed[3] or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.[4]

When the kaṭhina (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds,[5] or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.

For at most ten days means: it may be worn for ten days at the maximum.

When the kaṭhina privileges had been removed for one or other of the eight grounds for removing them, then the monk must assign his extra robe. At *Vin.* i. 289 monks are "allowed" to assign, *vikappeti*, an extra robe. *Cf. Vin.* i. 254 for the allowance to have as many robes as desired when the kaṭhina cloth has been made, and before the privileges, of which this is one, are removed.

[1] *kata*; *cf. katacīvara* at *Vin.* i. 256, a robe that is made up, finished, ready to wear, opposed to *cīvara*, robe-material, probably meaning not ready to wear, and *vippakatacīvara*, a robe or robe-material that is imperfectly executed, thus not ready to wear. *VA.* 638 says that *kata* means that it is finished by means of a needle.

[2] *VA.* 638, "carried off by thieves." On removal of kaṭhina privileges owing to loss of the robe-material, see *Vin.* i. 255 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, "destroyed by white ants."

[4] *cīvarâsā upacchinnā.* On a monk going away with the expectation of a robe and the removal of his kaṭhina privileges on various grounds, see *Vin.* i. 259 ff. *VA.* 638 says that "longing for a robe arises and is cut off. These are impediments to getting robes settled." The last four cases mean that a monk's responsibility for a robe is gone.

[5] Given at *Vin.* i. 255, also at *VA.* 638. See above, p. 5, n. 3, and *Vin. Texts* ii. 157 for a discussion of the validity of these grounds or reasons, *mātikā*, for removal. They are as follows: the ground depending on (the monk) having gone away, on (his robe being) settled, on his having resolved (not to have it finished), on (his robe) being lost, on his having heard (that the privileges are removed in a certain residence), on the lapse of an expectation (that a special gift of a robe would be made to him), on his having gone beyond the boundary (of the community to which the kaṭhina cloth was given), on the general removal (of the kaṭhina privileges of the whole Order). Removal means that the quality of kaṭhina will disappear (see above, p. 5, n. 1).

An extra robe means: one that is not allotted,[1] not assigned.[2]

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-materials[3] (including) the least one fit for assignment.[4] || 1 ||

For him who exceeds that period there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order,[5] or to a group,[6] or to an individual. And thus, monks, it should be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should

---

[1] *anadhiṭṭhita*. This means a robe used by a certain monk himself, rather than one not yet designated for a particular monk, and thus still at the disposal of the Order, not disposed of, not allotted. See *VA*. 642 ff. *Cf*. *niṭṭhita* in connection with robes, translated above as "settled." Also see n. on *adhiṭṭhāna*, *B.D*. i. 128. *C.P.D*. gives *adhiṭṭhita* as " determined " for a similar *Vin*. passage.

[2] *avikappita*, possibly meaning kept and given to another monk. At *Vin*. i. 289 monks are allowed to assign an extra robe; then presumably it ceases to be " extra." On the allowance to allot, not to assign (*adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetuṃ*) various articles, see *Vin*. i. 296 f.

[3] At *Vin*. i. 281 six kinds of robes were permitted to the monks: made of linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hemp, canvas. At *Vin*. i. 58, 96 these six are called benefits extra to rag-robes. *Cf*. below, pp. 40, 48, and *Vin*. iv. 60.

[4] *vikappanupagapacchima*. *P.E.D*. explains *vikappanupaga* as ' according to option," under *upaga*. But *vikappana* is a technical term meaning the assignment of robes. The meaning of *pacchima*, according to the Commentary, is " the least "—*i.e.*, the smallest in measurement according to the assignment or apportioning of the robes. For *VA*. 639 says, " having pointed out the kinds of robes (*i.e.*, the six kinds, as in note above), now, in order to point out the measure, he says *vikap° pacchimaṃ*. Its measure is two spans in length, one span in width. Thus the text says, ' Monks, the least robe that I allow you to assign is one that is eight finger-breadths in length and four finger-breadths wide according to the finger-breadth of the accepted standard ' " (*sugataṅgula*, *cf*. *Vin*. iv. 168). The ' text ' quoted by Bu. is *Vin*. i. 297. *Cf*. below, pp. 40, 48, 140.

[5] *saṁgha*, five or more monks; see *Vin*. i. 319.

[6] *gaṇa*; two to four monks.

speak[1] thus: 'Honoured sirs, this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed.[2] The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited[3] should be given back[4] (with the words): 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This robe of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right[5] to the Order, the Order should give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching two or three[6] monks, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder . . . joined palms, should speak thus: 'Honoured sirs, this robe [196] is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable ones.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. This robe of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the venerable ones. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let the

[1] passive construction, lit. "the Order should be spoken to."

[2] *āpatti desetabbā*. *VA*. 640, having greeted the Order (as above) the monk says, 'I, reverend sirs, having fallen into such and such an offence, that I confess. If there is one robe it constitutes one offence of expiation involving forfeiture; if there are two (robes) there are two (such offences); if there are many (robes) there is a multiplicity (of such offences).' He should forfeit his robe or robes saying, 'Here is a robe (are robes) to be forfeited for transgressing the ten days. I forfeit it (them) to the Order.' The same procedure is required if forfeiting them to a group or to one monk. The offending monk then says that he sees his offence, and is exhorted to restrain himself in the future.

[3] *nissaṭṭha-cīvara*, *nissaṭṭha* being p.p. of *nissajjati*.

[4] *dātabbaṃ*.

[5] *pattakalla*=*pattakāla*, having attained the (right) time.

[6] *sambahulā bhikkhū* in *Vin*. almost always means a *gaṇa*—*i.e.*, two to four monks. In the Suttapiṭaka the expression means "many monks." Yet at *Vin*. ii. 15 *sambahulā therā bhikkhū* apparently include eleven theras, and at *Vin*. i. 300 *sambahulā therā* include five elders; thus in these two passages *sambahulā* should be translated by "several, a number of."

venerable ones give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching one monk, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus to him: 'Your reverence,[1] this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable one.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by this monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): 'I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 || **3** ||

If he[2] thinks[3] that ten days have elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether ten days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not think that ten days have elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one[4] is allotted[5] when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is burnt

[1] *āvuso*; in preceding cases *bhante*.

[2] *i.e.* a monk.

[3] *saññī*, or "is aware." It has been suggested to me that the first two cases (excluding that of "is in doubt") are more definite in meaning than the later ones, and that therefore these first two might be translated by "is aware" and "is not aware," and the others by "thinks" and "does not think." But the Pali word is the same throughout.

[4] *i.e.* an extra robe.

[5] This and the next six cases=below, *Vin.* iii. 251 (without the "assigned" clause), 262.

when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1] If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, within ten days, it is allotted,[2] assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt,[3] if they tear it from him,[4] if they take it on trust[5]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[6] || **4** ||

Then[7] the group of six monks did not give back a robe that had been forfeited. They told this matter to the lord. He said: " Monks, a robe that has been for-

---

[1] *dukkata*, also to be confessed.

[2] *adhiṭṭheti*, accord. to *C.P.D.* to employ, adopt, keep for oneself.

[3] These clauses indicate that the monk has lost responsibility for the robe.

[4] *acchinditvā gaṇhanti.* This phrase appears to be a substitute for *vilumpati*, to steal, which as *avilutte viluttasaññī* occurs immediately after " burnt " in the preceding paragraph.

[5] *vissāsaṃ gaṇhanti.* At *Vin.* i. 296 things are allowed to be taken on trust from a monk endowed with five qualities: he must be an acquaintance and a friend, alive, he must have spoken about the thing taken, and must know that he will be pleased with the monk for taking it. *Cf.* also *Vin.* i. 308 for various cases where a robe taken on trust is said to be rightly taken or wrongly taken.

[6] *Cf.* Nissag. **2, 3, 28**; and *cf.* Bhikkhunī Nissag. **1,** where for " burnt " we get " broken " (of a bowl).

[7] *tena kho pana samayena*, very likely equivalent here to *atha*, then, for in this and similar contexts it does not mean so much " at one time," as at the more definite " then "—*i.e.*, at a time (shortly) after the rule had been laid down, but marking a continuation of the story which led up to and included the formulation of the rule.

feited is not not to be given back.[1] Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 5 || [197]

[1] *na nisaṭṭhacīvaraṃ na dātabbaṃ*; *cf.* below, p. 117, and *Vin.* iv. 245, where the same thing (using the double negative) is said of a bowl.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) II

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe[1]; these robes, deposited for a long time, became soiled[2]; the monks dried them in the sun. The venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these monks drying these robes in the sun. Seeing these monks he came up to them, and having come up he said to these monks:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes that are soiled?" Then these monks told this matter to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe?"[3] Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe?"

---

[1] That is with the *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, and the *uttarāsaṅga*, the upper robe or garment. The two together are called *santaruttara—i.e.*, *sa-antar'-uttara*, the inner one with the upper one. They did not wear the outer cloak, *VA*. 652. For notes on the three robes see above, p. 1, n. 2. This rule is in opposition to the previous one, where monks wore more than the prescribed number of robes; here they wear less than the right number. See also Bhikkhunī Pāc. 24.

[2] *VA*. 651, "having black and white circles on the places which had been touched by the perspiration."

[3] At *Vin*. i. 298 Ānanda himself, though through thoughtlessness, entered a village without his outer cloak.

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having entrusted robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's kaṭhina (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from his three robes,[1] even for one night, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[2]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

At that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: "Let the revered sir[3] come, we will nurse (him)." The

---

[1] *ticīvarena vippavaseyya*. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 123, where it is a dukkaṭa offence for a monk to be separated from his *nisīdana*, piece of cloth for sitting on, for four months.

[2] At *Vin.* i. 254 the five privileges allowable to monks after the ceremonial making of the kaṭhina-cloth, *atthatakaṭhina*, include one called *asamādānacāra*, translated, at *Vin. Texts* ii. 151, in accordance with Bu.'s explanation, as "going for alms without wearing the usual set of three robes," a relaxation of the above rule. At *Vin.* i. 298 it is a dukkaṭa offence for a monk to enter a village wearing (only) his inner and upper robes. But because Ānanda thoughtlessly did so on one occasion, the lord is reputed to have put forward five reasons for laying aside the outer cloak, five (identical) reasons for laying aside the upper and inner robes, and five (partly identical and partly different) reasons for laying aside the cloth for the rains. It is not said which reason covered Ānanda's lapse. When monks are staying in lodgings in the jungles they are allowed to lay aside one of the three robes in a house; but then it came about that if they are away from that robe for more than six nights, there is an offence; see Nissag. **29**.

[3] *bhaddanto*, an honorific title. *Cf.* below, p. 80, where an ill monk is allowed to travel without a rug, *santhata*, if he has the agreement of the Order as to the rug.

monks said: "Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you." He said:

"Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that one should not be away, separated from the three robes; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. I [**198**] will not go."

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.[1] And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.' A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill, he is not able to set out taking the three robes. He requests the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to

[1] *ticīvarena avippavāsasammutiṃ.* This means that by convention, by agreement among other monks, the one who is ill is regarded as *not* separated from his three robes, although in fact he is separated from them and goes away without them. On account of this agreement, *sammuti*, the separation, being regarded as no separation, does not count as an offence. *Cf.* also *sammuti* at, *e.g.*, Nissag. **14**; *Vin.* i. 283 f. The government is by democracy, for the monks agree among themselves. At *Vin.* i. 298 the illness of a monk is one of the reasons "allowed" for his laying aside his outer cloak. See *Vin.* i. 109 f. for agreement to, and removal of, *ticīvarena avippavāsa* in connection with *sīmā*, boundary.

me . . . the three robes. The Order gives the monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. Agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is given by the Order to the monk so and so, and it is pleasing to the venerable ones; therefore they are silent. So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's kaṭhina (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night, except on the agreement of the monks,[1] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 ||

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up for a monk, or lost or destroyed or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.[2]

When the kaṭhina (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds, or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.[2]

If this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night means: without the outer cloak, or without the upper robe, or without the inner robe.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

There is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited. . . . **[199]** 'Honoured sirs, these three robes were away, separated from me

[1] *Cf.* rule in Nissag. **29.**

[2] *Cf.* Nissag. I. **3,** 1.

for a night, without the agreement of the monks (and) are to be forfeited. I forfeit them to the Order . . .' '. . . should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

A village having one precinct,[1] various precincts; a dwelling having one precinct, various precincts; a stable[2] having one precinct, various precincts; a watch-tower[3] having one precinct, various precincts; a quadrangular building[4] having one precinct, various precincts; a long house[5] having one precinct, various precincts; a mansion[6] having one precinct, various precincts; a boat

[1] *ekupacāra* ; *cf. Vin.* iii. 46, *gāmupacāra.*

[2] *uddosita* ; *VA.* 654 expl., *yānâdīnaṃ bhaṇḍānaṁ sālā,* a room for such implements as waggons, etc.

[3] *aṭṭa* ; *VA.* 654 expl., "it is made with bricks for warding off hostile kings, and thick walls, and is four or five storeys high." *Cf. VbhA.* 366.

[4] *māla* (or *māḷa*). *Cf. Vin.* i. 140; *D.* i. 2; *Sn.*, p. 104. *SnA.* 447 calls *maṇḍalamālaṃ,* a *maṇḍapaṃ,* or pavilion. At *Vbh.* 251 this and the preceding building (*aṭṭa*) and the following one (*pāsāda*) are included in the definition of *senâsana,* lodgings. *VA.* 654 says that *māla* is *ekakūṭasaṅgahīto caturassapāsādo,* a quadrangular building comprised under one roof. *VbhA.* 366 quotes this definition, while also saying that *māla* is like an eating-hall, a pavilion. This and the next two, *pāsāda* and *hammiya,* occur, as *māla, pāsāya, hammiya* at *Āyaraṃgasutta* II. 7, 1, and are translated by Jacobi in *Jaina Sūtras* i. 105 as loft, platform, roof. See his note on *māla, loc. cit.* But from the *Comy.* it seems that *māla* and *pāsāda* are two different styles of houses, the one square, the other long, while *hammiya* is a larger type of house.

[5] *pāsādo ti dīghapāsādo, VA.* 654. *Pāsāda* has also been defined as the big buildings of kings; *cf.* below, p. 130, the *pāsāda* of King Bimbisāra. If a *pāsāda* type of building is built by other people, then it is called a *hammiya.*

[6] *hammiya.* See above, n. 4. *VA.* 654 calls it *muṇḍacchadanapāsādo,* a "long house" under a bare roof. This appears to be a house with what we should nowadays call a "sun-roof"—*i.e.*, all the rooms have ceilings, so that they are covered in; but over the whole or part of the uppermost rooms, although there are ceilings, there is no further outside roofing. This means that one can walk on the *upper* side of the ceiling with no roof over one. *Vin. Texts* i. 173, n. 1, says that *pāsāda* "is a long storeyed mansion (or, the whole of an upper storey). *Hammiya* is a *Pāsāda,* which has an upper chamber placed on the topmost storey."

having one precinct, various precincts; a caravan having one precinct, various precincts; a field having one precinct, various precincts; a threshing-floor[1] having one precinct, various precincts; a monastery[2] having one precinct, various precincts; a dwelling-place[3] having one precinct, various precincts; the foot of a tree having one precinct, various precincts; an open space having one precinct, various precincts. || 2 ||

A village having one precinct means: a village comes to be for one family,[4] and is enclosed[5]: laying aside the robe within the village, he should remain[6] within the village. It is not enclosed[7]: he should remain in the same house[8] as that in which the robe was laid aside,

---

At *Vin.* ii. 154 five kinds of roof (*chadana*) are given: of tiles (or bricks), stones, plaster, *tiṇa*-grass, palm-leaves. At *Vin.* ii. 146 *hammiya* is given with *vihāra, aḍḍhayoga, pāsāda* and *guhā* as the five *leṇāni*, abodes, allowed to monks, while at *Vin.* i. 58, 96 these are called "extra allowances," to dwelling at the foot of a tree; *Vin.* i. 239 names these five abodes as *paccantima vihāra kappiyabhūmi*, "outside building as a kappiyabhūmi" (*Vin. Texts* ii. 119) where the country people may keep and cook their stores; and at *Vin.* i. 284 the Order is allowed to agree upon any one of these that it desires as a storeroom for robe-material. At *Vin.* ii. 152 *hammiya* occurs as one of the three inner chambers, *gabbha*, allowed to monks. *Hammiya-gabbha* is translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 173 as "chambers on an upper storey," with quote from the *Comy.* in n. 5: *hammiyagabbho ti ākāsatale kuṭâgāragabbho mudaṇḍacchadanagabbho vā. Vin. Texts* i. 173, n. 1, quotes Bu.'s definition on *Vin.* i. 58: *hammiyan ti upariākāsatale patiṭṭhitakūṭâgāro pāsādo yeva.*

[1] *karaṇa ;* here, in *dhaññakaraṇa*, seems to mean preparing the doing. *VA.* 654 explains by *khala*, corn ready for threshing, or the threshing-floor.

[2] *VA.* 654, "a flower-park or an orchard."

[3] *vihāra.*

[4] *VA.* 652, "it is the village of one ruler or headman."

[5] *VA.* 652, "it is enclosed by a wall or by a fence or by a ditch."

[6] *vatthabbaṃ.* In this meaning *cf. Vin.* ii. 8. *VA.* 652, "he ought to wait in a place of his own choosing within the village until the sun rises."

[7] *VA.* 652, "it is shown by this that there are various precincts to this same village."

[8] *VA.* 652, "the definition of a house is that it is the dwelling of one family, etc."

or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.[1]

A village comes to be for various families,[2] and is enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside—either in the hall or at the entrance[3]—or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. Or if, going to the hall, laying aside the robe within a reach of the hand, either he should remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. The robe being laid aside in the hall, he should either remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 3 ||

A dwelling comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms[4]: laying aside the robe within the dwelling, he should remain within the dwelling. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A dwelling comes to be for various families, it is enclosed and there are various rooms, various inner rooms: he should remain in the same room as that in

[1] *hatthapāsa*. *VA*. 652 says that the robe should not be moved for more than two and a half linear measures—*i.e.*, *ratana*. *Cf.* *VbhA*. 343, *dve vidatthiyo ratanaṃ*. A *vidatthi* is a span of twelve fingers' breadth. *Cf.* also *Vin*. iii. 149. *VA*. 652 proceeds, "having gone beyond this measure, if the monk by psychic potency waits in the air until the sun rises, there is an offence involving forfeiture." *Hatthapāsa*, a reach of the hand, arm's length, is a technical term, always used in the *Vin*. to denote a distance of two and a half cubits around oneself.

[2] *VA*. 652, "it is a village belonging to various rulers and headmen, like Vesālī and Kusināra, etc."

[3] *dvāramūle*=*nagaradvārassa samīpe*, *VA*. 652.

[4] There is not much difference between *gabbha*, "room," and *ovāraka*, "inner room," but the latter is usually a bedroom, sleeping-apartment.

which the robe was laid aside, or at the main entrance,[1] or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 4 ||

A stable comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms: [200] laying aside the robe within the stable, he should remain within the stable. It is not enclosed: . . . (See || 4 ||) . . . A stable comes to be for various families. . . . It is not enclosed . . . or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 5 ||

A watch-tower comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the watch-tower, he should remain within the watch-tower. A watch-tower comes to be for various families; there are various rooms, various inner rooms; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside or at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 6 ||

A quadrangular building comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the quadrangular building (See || 6 ||) . . . A quadrangular building comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 7 ||

A long house comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the long house. . . . A long house comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 8 ||

A mansion comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the mansion. . . . A mansion comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 9 ||

[1] *VA.* 654, *dvāramūle=gharadvāramūle.*

A boat comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the boat. . . . A boat comes to be for various families; there are various rooms, various inner rooms[1]; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 10 ||

A caravan comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the caravan, seven *abbhantaras*[2] should not be removed before or behind, an *abbhantara* should not be removed from the side. A caravan comes to be for various families: laying aside a robe in the caravan, it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 11 ||

A field comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the field, he should remain within the field. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.[3] A field comes to be for various families, and is enclosed. Laying aside the robe within the field, he should either remain at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.[4] It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 12 ||

A threshing-floor comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the threshing-floor, he should remain on the threshing-floor. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A threshing-floor comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the

---

[1] *Cf.* the "ocean-going ship" of *A.* iv. 127=*S.* iii. 155, and the one at *Jā.* v. 75 which took five hundred passengers. Thus the Indians at the time of the compilation of these works were not apparently ignorant of quite large-scale shipbuilding.

[2] *abbhantara* also at *Vin.* i. 111. *VA.* 654 says, "here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands." See Intr., p. 50.

[3] *VA.* 654, "of the field."

[4] *v.ll.* at *Vin.* iii. 276 suggest some difficulty, even as though there were some omission.

threshing-floor, he should either remain at the gate, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 13 ||

A monastery comes to be for one family, and is enclosed.[1] . . . (See || 13 ||) . . . It is not enclosed. . . . A monastery comes to be for various families. . . . It is not enclosed; it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 14 || [201]

A dwelling-place comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the dwelling-place, he should remain within the dwelling-place.. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A dwelling-place comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside or at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 15 ||

A foot of a tree comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the shade, if he spreads it entirely in the shade at the time of mid-day, he must remain in the shade.[2] A foot of a tree comes to be for various families; it must not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 16 ||

An open space having one precinct means: in a jungle where there are no villages,[3] the same precinct is seven

---

[1] At *Vin.* ii. 154 monks were allowed to enclose their *ārāmas* (monasteries) with bamboo fences, thorn fences and ditches.

[2] The area is that to which the mid-day shadow spreads. People used to live at the foot of trees. *Mūla*, foot, is lit. root.

[3] *Cf.* definition of "jungle" at *Vin.* iii. 46, 51.

abbhantaras all round[1]; beyond that there are different precincts.[2] || 17 ||

If he thinks that he is away, separated when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is taken away[3] when it is not taken

---

[1] =*Vin.* i. 111. *VA.* 655 says, " standing in the middle there are seven *abbhantaras* extending to all quarters; sitting in the middle he guards the robe put down on the boundary of the eastern or western quarter. But if at the time of sunrise he goes as much as a hair's breadth to the eastern quarter, the robe is to be forfeited in the western quarter. But at the time of *uposatha*, beginning with the monks sitting at the outer circle of the congregation, the boundary of the seven *abbhantaras* should be removed, so that the boundary increases to the size to which the Order increases."

[2] Thus, in order to be in the same precinct as the robe, he has to be within seven *abbhantaras* of it.

[3] Meaning doubtful. *Paccuddhaṭa* seems=*paṭi*+*uddhaṭa* or *uddhata*, from *uddharati*. *Cf.* above, pp. 5, 15, *ubbhatasmiṃ kaṭhine*, and p. 6, n. 5. *Cf.* below, || 19 || *anto aruṇe paccuddharati* ; also p. 159; and *Vin.* iv. 121 f., *apaccuddhāraka* (said of a robe).

If, in this clause, the noun that governs *paccuddhaṭa* had been mentioned, the meaning of the verb would have been clearer. I think that it means " taken away " on the analogy of *ubbhata*, and that " robe " is the understood subject; see *VA.* 657. Thus *paccuddhaṭa* comes into line with the other past participles, *vissajjita*, *naṭṭha*, etc., whose subject here, as often elsewhere, is to be taken as " robe." A robe that is taken away means, as do these other verbs (see also " no offence " paragraph), that a monk is no longer responsible for it. Secondly, there is the suggestion that *a-paccuddhaṭa* means " not (formally) given "; see *C.P.D.* In this context, the noun to be supplied could also be " the agreement," for *paccuddharati* does not appear to be a verb used for giving or distributing robes to monks; and in this case the monk had his robe and was asking permission to be away from it. But if we were to read " the agreement is taken away," we should still have to explain *paccuddharati* in the " no offence " paragraph, and the point would

away . . . If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is no offence. || 18 ||

There is no offence if before sunrise[1] it is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from him; if they take it on trust[2]; if there is the agreement of the monks,[3] if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 19 || **3** ||

---

then arise, Could monks, or did they, rescind an agreement once they had given it? Thirdly, the kaṭhina privileges might be the subject of *paccuddhaṭa, paccuddharati*, for their removal has been mentioned as a condition in the rule: it is an offence to be absent from the robes if the privileges are removed. Hence there could only be "no offence" if they are *not* removed, whereas the reverse is stated to be the case. Moreover, *ubbhata*, not *paccuddhaṭa*, is the normal way of speaking of the kaṭhina privileges that are removed.

[1] *anto aruṇe=anto-aruṇagga*, "the time before sunset," so *C.P.D.*

[2] *Cf.* Nissag. **1, 3, 21** ("broken"=*Vin.* iv. 245), **27, 29.**

[3] All these clauses show that in some way the monk's responsibility for the robe had gone.

[4] *Cf.* below, p. 159.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) III

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time a robe[1] accrued to[2] a certain monk not at the right time.[3] The robe, as they made it, did not suffice for him. Then [202] that monk, pulling out that robe, smoothed it again and again.[4] The lord, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw this monk pulling out this robe and smoothing it again and again, and seeing him he approached this monk, and having approached he said to this monk:

"Why, monk, do you, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again?"

"Lord, this robe which accrued to me not at the right time, as they made it does not suffice for me, therefore do I, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again."

"But, monk, is there for you an expectation of a robe?"[5]

"There is, lord," he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you, having accepted a robe not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe."[6] || 1 ||

---

[1] *cīvara* means both the made-up robe and the robe-material or robe-cloth.

[2] *uppannaṃ hoti*. *Cf.* above, p. 4, n. 3; below, pp. 90, 99.

[3] *akālacīvara*. Also at *Vin*. iv. 245, 246, 284, 287.

[4] *VA*. 658, "thinking, if one gets rid of the creases, it will be big (enough for me), sprinkling it with water, treading upon it with his feet, pulling it out with his hands and taking it up, he rubbed it across his back . . . but dried by the sun, it (*i.e.*, the robe-material) became as small as before, so he did this again."

[5] *cīvarapaccāsā*. *Cf.* *cīvarâsā* at *Vin*. i. 259 ff., and *bhattapaccāsā* at *Vin*. iv. 77.

[6] *Cf.* Nissag. II, where monks are not allowed to wear extra robes.

Then monks said: "It is allowed by the lord, if a robe has been accepted not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe." These, accepting robes not at the right time, laid them aside for more than a month. These robes, tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.[1] Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes. Seeing them, he addressed the monks thus:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?"

"Your reverence, they are our robes, given not at the right time, that are laid aside in the expectation of robes."

"But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?"

"For more than a month, your reverence," they said.

Then the venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, having accepted robe-material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month?"

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks having accepted robe-material not at the right time, laid it aside for more than a month?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted robe-material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased. . . . And thus also, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's

[1] *cīvaravaṃsa*, with *cīvararajju* allowed at *Vin.* i. 286, ii. 121. *Cf.* below, p. 152.

kaṭhina (privileges) have been removed, if robe-material should accrue to the monk not at the right time, it may be accepted by that monk if he so wish. Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly. But if it is not sufficient for him, that robe-material may be laid aside by that monk for a month at most, should he have any expectation that the deficiency may be supplied.[1] If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 || **1** || [**203**]

When the robe-material is settled means: . . . (See Nissag. II. **3**) . . . or they are removed before the time by the Order.

If robe-material (*should accrue*) *not at the right time* means: some that has accrued during the eleven months[2] when the kaṭhina cloth is not (formally) made[3]; some that has accrued during the seven months when the kaṭhina cloth is (formally) made, even a gift (of material) offered[4] at the right time; this means robe-material (accruing) not at the right time.

---

[1] Lit. "for the completion of," *pāripūriyā*.

[2] *VA*. 658, "setting aside one last month of the rainy season (*kattika*), there remain eleven months."

[3] *atthata*, from *attharati*, lit. "to spread out." Not, however, to be taken literally here, but as the ceremony of making the robes at the end of the rains. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 148 n. for very interesting remarks on distributing the robes, and above, p. 5, n. 1.

These curious expressions, "during the eleven, during the seven months," mean, I think, that, in the case of the eleven, the kaṭhina cloth is only distributed in the month following the termination of the rains; therefore there would be eleven months when it is not made. In the case of the seven months, it is probably meant that no making of robes takes place during the rains, but that in unusual circumstances robe-material might be given to a monk during the remaining seven months of the year. *VA*. 658 says that the four months of the rainy season (*kattika*) are in the winter; thus setting aside five months (*i.e.*, these, with the one remaining over after "eleven months"), there remain seven. *Cf. VA*. 729. *Cf.* above, p. 5, n. 3; below, p. 154, n. 3.

[4] *ādissa*; *VA*. 658, *uddisitvā*.

Should accrue means: should accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as rag-robes, or by means of his own property.[1]

If he so wish means: himself desiring, it may be accepted.

Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly means: it should be made up within ten days.

But if it is not sufficient for him means: if it is not enough to be worn.

That robe-material may be laid aside by that monk for a month at most[2] means: it may be laid aside for a month at the maximum.[2]

That the deficiency may be supplied means: for the sake of supplying the deficiency.

Any expectation means: there is expectation from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as to rag-robes, or by means of his own property.[3] || 1 ||

If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied) means: if a robe that was expected accrues on the very day that the first robe[4] accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. . . . If a robe that was expected accrues two days . . . three days . . . four days . . . five days . . . six days . . . seven days . . . eight days . . . nine days . . . ten days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. If a robe that was expected accrues eleven days . . . twelve days . . . thirteen days . . . fourteen days . . . fifteen days . . . sixteen days . . . seventeen days . . . eighteen

---

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 91. [2] *paramaṃ* . . : *paramatā*.

[3] *VA.* 658, "on a certain day the Order or a group will receive robes, and there will be a robe for me; . . . a robe has been ordered for me by my relations, by a friend; when these come they will give the robes. . . . I will get a robe from the dust-heap, . . . by my own property, meaning cotton threads, etc." This last must mean that if he has the means of sewing the robes together, he may do so. *Cf.* below, p. 91.

[4] *mūlacīvara*, as opposed to *paccāsā-cīvara*, the robe that was expected (*VA.* 659).

days . . . nineteen days . . . twenty days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days . . . twenty-one days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within nine days . . . twenty-two . . . twenty-three . . . twenty-four . . . twenty-five . . . twenty-six days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within four days. If a robe that was expected accrues twenty-seven . . . twenty-eight . . . twenty-nine days . . . he should have it made up within one day. If a robe that was expected accrues thirty days after the first robe accrues, on that same day it should be allotted, assigned, bestowed. But should it not be allotted or assigned or bestowed, it is to be forfeited on the thirty-first day at sunrise; [**204**] it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . 'This robe, honoured sirs, (given) not at the right time, is to be forfeited by me, the month having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . 'The Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 ||

If the robe that was expected accrues but is different from the first robe that has accrued, and there are some nights over,[1] it should not be caused to be made up unwillingly.[2] If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has elapsed . . . If he does not think that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed . . . If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not allotted . . . If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned

[1] *I.e.*, the month not being finished (*VA*. 659).

[2] *akāma*. *VA*. 659, "if the first robe is soft and the robe that was expected is coarse and it is impossible to mix them, and there are nights, though not a month, remaining, the robe should not be caused to be made up unwillingly. But taking another robe that was expected, this should be made up after an interval, and the robe that was expected should be assigned as a cloth used for water-strainers."

. . . If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has not elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence if within a month it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[1] || 4 || **2** ||

[1] *Cf.* Nissag. I, II, XXVIII, XXIX; and Nissag. XXI=*Vin.* iv. 245 (" broken " instead of " burnt ").

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) IV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time[1] the former wife of the venerable Udāyin had gone forth among the nuns. She frequently came to the venerable Udāyin, and the venerable Udāyin frequently went to this nun. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin used to participate in a meal with this nun. Then the venerable Udāyin, dressing in the morning,[2] taking his bowl and robe, approached this nun, and having approached and disclosed his private parts in front of this nun, he sat down on a seat. And further, the nun having disclosed her private parts in front of the venerable Udāyin, sat down on a seat. Then the venerable Udāyin, impassioned, looked at and thought about[3] this nun's private parts and emitted semen. Then the venerable Udāyin said to this nun:

"Go, sister, fetch water, I will wash the inner robe." [205]

"Give[4] it (to me), master, I will wash it myself," and she took hold of one part with her mouth and placed one part on her private parts. Because of this she conceived a child. The nuns spoke thus:

"This nun is one who does not lead the Brahma-life, (because) she is pregnant."

(She, saying,) "Ladies,[5] I am not one who does not lead the Brahma-life," told this matter to the nuns.

---

[1] Opening phrases are the same as those of Pāc. 30.

[2] *pubbaṇha* and *aparaṇha* are the morning and the afternoon. *Cf. KhuA.* 105.

[3] *upanijjhāyati* has sense of "to look at (eagerly)" and "to reflect on."

[4] *āharati* has sense of "to give" here.

[5] *ayye.*

The nuns looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can master Udāyin get a soiled robe[1] washed by a nun?" Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin get a soiled robe washed by a nun?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, got a soiled robe washed by a nun?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Was she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?"

"She was not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man,[2] one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant for a woman who is not a relation. Thus you, foolish man, will get a soiled robe washed by a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should get a soiled robe washed or dyed[3] or beaten[4] by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[5] || **1** ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

(*A nun*) *who is not a relation* means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.[6]

---

[1] *purāṇa-cīvara*, lit. "old robe."

[2] Oldenberg's edn. has *moghapuriso*; but see Sinhalese edn., and also below, pp. 39, 44, where the voc., *moghapurisa*, occurs in similar contexts.

[3] Six kinds of dyes allowed at *Vin.* i. 286.

[4] At *Vin.* i. 286 monks are allowed to beat, *ākoṭeti*, with the hands robe-material that has become harsh.

[5] *Cf.* Nissag. XVII for both "rule" and *Old Comy.*

[6] *Cf.* below, Nissag. VI. **3**, 1. This definition=*Vin.* iii. 212, 214, 216, 219, 235; *Vin.* iv. 60, 61.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.[1]

A soiled robe means: dressed in[2] it once, put on[3] once.

Wash means: he gives an order[4]—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Beat means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If once having given a blow with the palm (of the hand) or a blow with a club, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this soiled robe which I had washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back. . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' " || 1 || [206]

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash (his) soiled robe,

[1] =below, pp. 40, 96, and *passim*. *VA*. 660, "she is ordained by a motion of the Order of nuns where the resolution is put three times and followed by the decision (as the fourth item, *ñatticatuttha*), then she is ordained in the same way by the Order of monks. Therefore she is ordained by eight Vinaya acts."

[2] *nivattha*, p.p. of *nivāseti*. It refers to the *antaravāsaka*, the inner or under robe that hangs down from the waist, and to the *uttarāsaṅga*, upper robe; also to the cloths for the rains (Nissag. XXIV), to garments worn by members of other sects (*Vin*. i. 305 f.), to garments called *akkanāla* and *potthaka* (*Vin*. i. 306 f.), to nuns' vests (*VA*. 663), to a laywoman's outer cloak, *sāṭaka*, *Vin*. iv. 18.

[3] *pāruta*, p.p. of *pārupati*. It refers to the *saṅghāṭi*, outer cloak; also to a (costly) *paṭa*, or cloth (below, p. 109), and to *vihāracīvara*, and other things that a monk may put on, *pārupituṃ*, to cover the body if the robes are stolen or lost (Nissag. VI, p. 46, below). Thus, for a monk, both *nivāseti* and *pārupati* are required to indicate the putting on or dressing in the complete set of three robes. *Cf*. *Vin*. iv. 281 f., where the two words occur in connection with the five kinds of robes a nun should wear. See below, p. 88, where "old rug," *purāṇasanthata*, is defined as is "soiled robe," *purāṇacīvara*, above.

[4] *VA*. 660, "the nun who was ordered prepares an oven, collects sticks, makes a fire, fetches water, until, having washed it, she holds it up: there is an offence of wrong-doing in each action for the monk."

there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.[1] If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there

[1] *nissaggiyena āpatti dukkaṭassa;* probably *pācittiya* omitted merely for the sake of brevity.

is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation . . . If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation . . . If he makes her wash another's soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes her wash a sheet (used as) a piece of cloth for sitting on,[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it,[2] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence when a female relation is washing it if a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked[3]; if he makes her wash an unused

[1] A compound word in Pali, *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa*. *Nisīdana* is a piece of cloth for sitting on; *paccattharaṇa* is the bed-clothes, really a piece of cloth for covering a bed or chair, thus a sheet. *Cf.* below, p. 46, n. 3. At *Vin.* i. 295 a *nisīdana* was found to be too small to protect the whole lodging; to meet this difficulty the lord is reputed to have allowed a *paccattharaṇa*, made as large as one wishes. It looks therefore as if *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa* is either a sheet that is a piece of cloth to sit upon, although larger than a mere "piece of cloth to sit upon," the mere *nisīdana*; or that it is a sheet used as, or instead of, a piece of cloth for sitting on. *Cf. nisīdana-santhata*, in Nissag. XV, below, p. 87, and both in Introduction.

[2] *VA.* 662, "causing it to be washed by one who was ordained (only) in the presence of the nuns is an offence of wrong-doing, and it is the same for one who has been ordained (only) in the presence of the monks; five hundred Sakyan women were ordained in the presence of the monks."

[3] *VA.* 662, "if she has come for the Exposition and the Exhortation, seeing the soiled robe and taking it from the place where it was put, she says: 'Give it, master, I will wash it,' and when it is brought

one; if he makes her wash another requisite,[1] except the robe; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || 3 || 2 ||

---

she washes it and moreover dyes it and beats it—this is called 'she washes it unasked' (*avuttā*). If she hears a monk ordering a youth or a novice to wash the robe, she says: 'Bring it, master, I will wash it,' and she washes it, or taking it for a time, having washed it and dyed it, she then gives it back—this is called 'she washes it unasked.'"

[1] *Ibid.*, "a sandal, bowl, shoulder-strap, girdle, couch, chair, straw mat."

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 97 f.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) V

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the nun Uppalavaṇṇā[1] was staying at Sāvatthī. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, dressing in the morning [207] and taking her bowl and robe, entered Sāvatthī for alms-food. Having wandered about Sāvatthī for alms-food, returning from her alms-gathering after her meal,[2] she approached the Blind Men's Grove[3] for the mid-day rest; having plunged into the Blind Men's Grove she sat down at the foot of a tree for the mid-day rest. Now at that time some thieves, having done their deeds,[4] having killed a cow[5] and taken the flesh, entered the Blind Men's Grove. Then the robber-chief saw the nun Uppalavaṇṇā as she was sitting at the foot of the tree for the mid-day rest, and seeing her, it occurred to him:

---

[1] *Vin.* iii. 35 tells the story of the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā by a brahmin youth; see *B.D.* i. 53, n. 5.

[2] *pacchābhatta* ; *bhatta* usually means cooked rice. As this is the main thing put into the bowl, it has come to mean the whole meal.

[3] Malalasekera, *D.P.P.N.* i. 111, says, "'Blind,' usually, but wrongly, translated 'Dark'." He gives the story accounting for the name of this Grove, an episode that must have taken place before the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā, as it is said (*DhA.* ii. 49, 52) that after that time nuns were not to stay in this Grove. *VA.* 662 also says that Uppalavaṇṇā entered the Blind Men's Grove, because the rule of training had not then been laid down. Those who translate *andhavana* as "Dark Grove" think of it, rightly or wrongly, as a Grove where, because it is so dark, it is impossible to see anything.

[4] *kata-kammā—i.e.*, committed thefts. Said of *māṇava* (*Comy. cora*, thief) at *A.* iii. 102, and of *cora* at *Vism.* 180, *Jā.* iii. 34.

[5] The cow was probably not so sacred then as now, and the cattle-thief common in those days.

" If my sons and brothers see this nun they will trouble her," and he went by a different way.[1]

Then that robber-chief, taking the best meats of the cooked meat, tying (them up) in a leaf-packet, and hanging it up on a tree near the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, said: " Whatever recluse or brahmin sees it, it is given (to him), let him take it,"[2] and having spoken thus, he departed. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, arising from contemplation,[3] heard these words of that robber-chief as he was speaking.[4] Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, taking that meat, went to the nunnery. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, having prepared[5] that meat at the end of that night, tying it up into a bundle with her upper robe,[6] rising in the air,[7] reappeared in the Bamboo Grove. || 1 ||

Now at that time the lord was visiting the village for alms-food, and the venerable Udāyin came to be the one left behind as guardian of the dwelling. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

" Where, honoured sir, is the lord ?"

---

[1] *VA.* 662, " It is said that formerly the robber-chief knew the *therī*, therefore seeing her as he went in front of the robbers, he said: ' Do not go there, all come here,' and taking them he went by another way."

[2] By these words the meat was made *kappiya*, allowable, and became a gift that might be taken.

[3] On *samādhi* as a term in Hindu philosophy, see Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, 49-52. It is there rendered as " unification," " identification," " ecstatic consciousness." It is possible that the " sense of immediate contact with ultimate reality, of the unification of the different sides of our nature," was not absent from the Early Buddhist conception of *samādhi*.

[4] *VA.* 663, " It is said that the *therī* arose from contemplation at the appointed time: he spoke (the words reported above) at that very moment, and she heard and thought, ' There is no other *samaṇa* or brahmin here but me.' "

[5] *sampādetvā*, possibly " roasted."

[6] =*Vin.* iv. 162.

[7] On *vehāsa* as " above the ground " see *B.D.* i. 79, n. 6.

He said, " Sister, the lord has entered the village for alms-food."

" Give this meat to the lord, honoured sir," she said.

" You, sister, have pleased the lord with this meat; if you were to give me your inner robe, likewise would I become pleased with the inner robe."[1]

" But we women, honoured sir, get things with difficulty. This is my last, (my) fifth robe.[2] I shall not give it to you," she said.

" It is as if, sister, a man giving an elephant should caparison[3] its girth,[4] yet even so do you, sister, (though) giving meat to the lord, not give[3] me your inner robe."[5]

Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, being pressed by the venerable Udāyin, giving him her inner robe, went to the nunnery. The nuns, taking the nun Uppalavaṇṇā's bowl and robe, said to the nun Uppalavaṇṇā:

" Lady, where is your inner robe?"

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā told this matter to the nuns. The nuns [**208**] looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun? Women come by things with difficulty." And

---

[1] *VA*. 663, Udāyin is filled with lust and greed.

[2] *Ibid.*, she did not speak from greed, for " in those who have destroyed the cankers there is no greed "; but there was no robe left over of the five that were to be worn by nuns. These five, as *pañca cīvarāni*, are referred to at *Vin*. iv. 281 f. At *Vin*. ii. 272 it is said that the three usual robes, the vest, *saṃkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth, should be pointed out to women who wish to receive the upasampadā ordination. Nuns were also allowed indoors robes or cloths, *āvasathacīvara* (*Vin*. ii. 217), but apparently such things were handed from nun to nun as need arose (*Vin*. iv. 303).

[3] *sajjeyya*. *Sajjeti* is to send out, to prepare, equip, fit up, decorate, deck out, and came to mean to give.

[4] *kaccha*, here acc. pl. It is the girth or middle of an animal. If a present of an elephant is being made, a decorated cloth to be tied round his middle should also be given.

[5] Here there is a parallelism between *kaccha*, an accessory of the elephant, and *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, which Udāyin thought might accompany the gift of meat. The meat had been wrapped up in the nun's upper robe, and it is to be presumed that she was in consequence going about in her inner robe; see Intr., p. xviii.

then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, accepted a robe from a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

"Is she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?"

"She is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right[1] or what is wrong for a woman who is not a relation.[2] Thus you, foolish man, will accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 || **1** ||

Then scrupulous monks did not accept exchange of robes[3] with nuns. The nuns . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the masters not accept exchange of robes with us?"

Monks heard these nuns who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you to accept exchange among these

---

[1] *santa*, meaning "right" or "existent."

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 44, and *Vin.* iv. 59. Also above, p. 31, where, however, we get *pāsādika* and *apāsādika*, pleasant and unpleasant, instead of *santa* and *asanta*, right and wrong.

[3] *pārivattakacīvara*. *Cf. parivatteti*, to barter, p. 55, below.

five (classes of people)[1]: a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, a female novice. I allow you, monks, to accept exchange among these five (classes of people). And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[2] || 2 ||

Whatever means: . . . (See Nissag. IV. 2, 1) . . .

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.[3] [**209**]

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.[4]

Except in exchange means: without an exchange.

He accepts: in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; it should be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe, accepted from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the woman is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except

---

[1] *VA*. 663, "among these five (kinds of) co-religionists having the same faith, the same morality, the same views."

[2] At *Vin*. iv. 60 it is a pācittiya to give (*dātuṃ*) a robe to a nun who is not related, except in exchange.

[3] =above, p. 32, below, p. 96, and *Vin*. iv. 52, 55, 57, 60, *passim*.

[4] =above, p. 7, and see there n. 4; see also below, pp. 48, 140.

in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he accepts a robe, except in exchange, from the hand of a woman ordained by one (Order only),[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if she is a relation; if there is an exchange; if there is a large thing for a small thing, or a small thing for a large thing[2]; if a monk takes it on trust[3]; if he takes it for the time being; if he takes another requisite, except the robe; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

---

[1] *VA.* 664, "taking from the hand of a woman ordained in the presence of nuns (only), is an offence of wrong-doing; but from one ordained in the presence of monks (only), is an offence of expiation."

[2] *VA.* 664, "if bartering a precious sandal, a robe, shoulder-strap, waist-band, for a robe of little value, he accepts that robe, there is no offence."

[3] At *Vin.* iv. 60 it is the nun who may take on trust, the monk giving.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,[1] came to be skilled[2] in giving dhamma-talk.[3] Now at that time a certain son of a (great) merchant[4] approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance.[5] As he was sitting at a respectful distance, the venerable Upananda, the

---

[1] He had a novice, Kaṇḍaka, who behaved badly, *Vin.* i. 79, 85. At *Vin.* i. 153, having promised Pasenadi to spend the rains with him, he went to another place; and at *Vin.* i. 300, having spent the rains at one place, he accepted a share of robes at others. At *Vin.* ii. 165, coming late to a meal, he made a monk get up and give him his place. At *Vin.* ii. 168 he took two lodgings, and is also called a "maker of strife, quarrelsome." He is mentioned in Nissag. **8, 9, 10, 18, 20, 25, 27,** and in various Pācittiyas.

[2] *paṭṭho,* probably for *paddho.* *VA.* 665 says, *paṭṭho ti cheko samattho paṭibalo.*

[3] *dhammī kathā.* Here, more a talk on religious or philosophical matters than the "reasoned talk" given by the lord before modifying one of the rules. See above, pp. 4, 14.

[4] *seṭṭhiputta. Seṭṭhi* is a banker and a trader combined, hence a merchant, head of a guild. He is primarily a merchant, and a banker only because a merchant, and because there were no banks in those days. *Seṭṭhi-putta* indicates that the father was still alive, so that his son, the *seṭṭhiputta,* is not yet head of the firm, but will be on the death of his father. He would then become a *seṭṭhi.*

[5] *ekamantaṃ nisīdi,* lit. sat down to one side, or end. In sitting down in the presence of an honoured person, care should be taken not to sit down in any of the six wrong ways, or *nisajjadosa.* These are *atidūra, accāsanna, uparivāta, unnatappadesa, atisammukha, atipacchā,* too far, too near, to windward, on a higher seat, too much in front, too much behind; see *VA.* 129=*MA.* i. 110; *UdA.* 53 (abbreviated); *SA.* i. 16 for similar six wrong ways of standing; and *cf. SA.* ii. 86 for a different set of six *nisajjadosa.* To consider all these difficulties, and to sit down so as to cause no discomfort to the honoured person, is *ekamantaṃ nisīdi.*

son of the Sakyans, gladdened . . . and delighted that son of a (great) merchant with dhamma-talk. And then the son of the (great) merchant, having been gladdened . . . and delighted by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with dhamma-talk, said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Honoured sir, do let me know what will be of use.[1] We are able to [**210**] give to the master, that is to say of the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick."[2]

"If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these,"[3] he said.

"Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these."

A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant . . . A third time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant: "If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these."

"Now, honoured sir, for us who are sons of respectable families, it is awkward[4] to go out with (only) one piece of cloth. Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these."

---

[1] *yena attho*. *Cf. B.D.* i. 222 for same expression.

[2] Gen. or dat. pl. used here instead of acc. pl., which usually goes with *dātuṃ*, to give.

[3] *ito*. This refers to the two pieces of cloth that a man would ordinarily wear, as is done today in India, except in the Punjab: the *dhoti* and the *chaddar*, the one put on at the waist, and the other to cover the top part of the body. The son of the merchant, in this story, presumably had on no more than the customary two pieces of cloth, so that if he gave one away, he would have to go partially naked. So he said, "Wait."

[4] *kismiṃ viya*=*kiṃ viya*, it is what ? it is like what ? There is no English expression to render this exactly, but in most Indian languages there is something of the sort. The origin of the expression is obscure. *Cf.* "it is awkward to go empty-handed," *kismiṃ viya rittahatthaṃ gantuṃ*, below, p. 321, and n. 4.

"What is the good, sir, of your offering without desire to give, because even after you have offered you do not give?"

Then that son of the (great) merchant, being pressed by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, giving one cloth, went away. || 1 ||

People, seeing the son of a (great) merchant, spoke thus:

"Why do you, master, come with (only) one cloth?" Then this son of a (great) merchant told this matter to these people. The people looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; among them it is not easy to make reasonable requests.[1] How can they take a cloth when a reasonable request was made by the son of a (great) merchant?"

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, ask the son of a (great) merchant for a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, asked the son of the (great) merchant for a robe?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?"

"He is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.[2] Thus you, foolish man, will ask a son of a (great) merchant for a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing

[1] *dhammanimantana*, a request such as could reasonably be made by a pious man to a good monk, a request made to religious people in a suitable way. Here the monk presumed on the request made him by the merchant's son. [2] *Cf.* above, p. 39.

those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should ask a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 || **1** ||

Now at that time several monks[1] [**211**] were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvatthī. Midway on the road, thieves issuing forth, plundered these monks.[2] Then these monks said:

"It is forbidden by the lord to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation for a robe." And being scrupulous, they did not ask, (but) going naked as they were to Sāvatthī, they saluted the monks respectfully. The monks said:

"Your reverences, these Naked Ascetics[3] are very good because they respectfully salute these monks."[4]

They said: "Your reverences, we are not Naked Ascetics, we are monks."

The monks said to the venerable Upāli: "If so,[5] reverend Upāli, question these."[6]

Then the venerable Upāli, having questioned these monks,[7] said to the monks: "These are monks, your reverences; give them robes."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can monks come naked? Should they not come covered up with grass or leaves?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on

---

[1] *sambahulā bhikkhū*, or "two or three" or "many monks"; see above, p. 8, n. 6.

[2] *VA*. 665, "they stole their bowls and robes."

[3] *ājīvakā*.

[4] Or, "these Naked Ascetics who respectfully salute these monks are very good."

[5] *iṅgha*.

[6] *VA*. 665, "ask them for the sake of knowing their status as monks."

[7] *Ibid.*, "he asked them about the pabajjā and the upasampadā ordinations, and about bowls and robes."

that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow, monks, one whose robe is stolen or one whose robe is destroyed, to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe. If there is for the Order at the first residence[1] which he approaches either a robe in the dwelling-place[2] or a bed-cover[3] or a ground-covering[4] or a mattress-

[1] *āvāsa*. *Cf.* *B.D.* i. 314, n. 3. *Āvāsa* appears to be largely a monastic term, *nivesana* being a layman's dwelling. I think that the arrangement was as follows: *ārāma* was a whole monastery, consisting of the grounds and the buildings; *āvāsa* was the "colony" or place in which the monks lived. In general, the larger *āvāsa* may be said to have contained, besides such "rooms" as the uposatha hall, the refectory, the warming-room and so on, a number of *vihāras*. These were the separate rooms or dwelling-places, each given over to one monk, or if he had a *saddhivihārin* to two, to live in and use as his quarters, while staying at that particular *ārāma*.

The so-called "temples," the *ārāmas*, of Ceylon today contain five buildings on the "temple" or monastery site: the *thūpa*, the shrine-room, the hall of residence for monks (containing separate rooms for each monk), the teaching-hall (school) and the preaching hall. Several cells or rooms, *pariveṇa* or *vihāra*, suitable for not more than one monk to sleep in, lead off some of the large caves at Ellora and Ajanta.

[2] *vihāracīvara*. As far as I know the word occurs only here. *VA*. 666 says, "people having had a residence erected, thinking, 'Let the four requisites belonging to us be of use (to the monks),' making ready sets of three robes and depositing them in the residence that they have erected—this is what is called a *vihāracīvara*." It thus seems to be a robe put by in case of need in a residence, and more specifically in the *vihāra*, or dwelling-place portion of it—*i.e.*, not in the refectory or any of the other rooms used together by the community.

[3] *uttarattharaṇa*. This is a cover for a bed or chair, used out of respect for the person who uses the bed or chair, so as to prevent his clothes from being soiled. *VA*. 666 says that it is called a sheet for spreading on or over a couch, *uttarattharaṇan ti mañcakassa upari attharaṇakaṃ paccattharaṇaṃ vuccati*. At *VA*. 776 *uttarattharaṇa* is called a sheet that may be spread over couches and chairs, *uttarattharaṇan ti nāma mañcapīṭhānaṃ upari attharitabbakaṃ paccattharaṇaṃ*. On *paccattharaṇa* see above, p. 34, n. 1.

[4] *bhummattharaṇa*. *VA*. 666, "when the earth is prepared, they cover it for the sake of preserving its texture with carpets; spreading out a straw mat above this they walk up and down." At *VA*. 776 *bhummattharaṇa* is called a mat for sitting or lying on, *kaṭasāraka*, that may be spread on the ground. *Cf.* below, p. 73.

cover,[1] (I allow) him to take it to put on, if he says, 'Getting (a robe), I will replace[2] it.' But if there is not for the Order either a robe in the dwelling-place or a bed-cover or a ground-covering or a mattress-cover, then he should come covered up with grass or leaves; but he should not come naked. Who should so come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[3] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. This is the right time in this case: if a monk becomes one whose robe is stolen or whose robe is destroyed; in this case this is the right time." || 2 ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.[4]

A householder means: he who lives in a house.[5]

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.[5] [212]

---

[1] *bhisicchavi*. *VA*. 666, "the outer skin (*chavi*) of a mattress for a couch or a mattress for a chair." *Bhisi*, a mattress, may mean a door-rug, something thick for wiping the feet, or a cushion. In fact, anything like a mattress afterwards came to be called *bhisi*. At *Vin*. iv. 40 (=below, p. 240) five materials are given of which a *bhisi* might lawfully be made. See also *Vin. Texts* ii. 210, n.

[2] *odahissāmi*. *VA*. 667 explains by *puna ṭhapessāmi*, "I will deposit again."

[3] *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 305: whatever monk adopts nakedness, the adoption of members of other sects, there is a grave offence; Visākhā's strictures on nakedness for monks and nuns, *Vin*. i. 292, 293; and Nissag. XXIV. below. At the root of the desire that monks should be clothed was the need, lay and monastic, to differentiate between *bhikkhus* and *titthiyas*, or those of them who were Naked Ascetics.

[4] *Cf*. above, p. 31; below, p. 55.

[5] *Cf*. below, p. 55. *Ajjhāvasati* is, according to *C.P.D.*, "to dwell in (as an owner)."

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.[1]

Except at the right time means: setting the right time to one side.

One whose robe is stolen means: a monk's robe becomes stolen[2] by kings or by thieves or by rogues, or it becomes stolen by anyone whatsoever.

One whose robe is destroyed means: a monk's robe becomes burnt by fire, or it becomes carried away by water,[3] or it becomes eaten by rats and white ants, or it becomes worn by use. || 1 ||

If he asks, except at the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'This robe, honoured sirs, asked for by me from a householder who is not a relation, except at the right time, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 ||

If he thinks that a man (or woman) is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is not a relation (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation,

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 7, and n. 4; p. 40, and below, p. 140.

[2] Here presumably with the sense of "taken forcibly."

[3] *udakena vuḷhaṃ; cf. Vin.* i. 32. Sinhalese edn. has *vūḷhaṃ*, which I understand to be the correct form.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence if it is at the right time; if they belong to relations; if they are invited[1]; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 4 || **3** ||

---

[1] *VA*. 667 seems to take *ñātakānaṃ pavāritānaṃ* together—*i.e.*, without the comma of the text. *Comy*. says " if they are for relations who are invited "; and later *pavāritānaṃ* is taken up again, " whoever having invited, but who owing to foolishness or forgetfulness, does not give, should be asked. . . . If he says, ' I invite you to my house,' going to his house you should sit down for as long as desirable, or lie down, but take nothing. If he says, ' I invite you to whatever is in my house,' you should ask for what is allowable there." *Cf.* below, pp. 52, 57.

[2] *VA*. 667, " if he asks for a robe by means of utensils allowable to monks (*kappiyabhaṇḍa*), if it is by an allowable procedure (*kappiyavohārena*)." *Cf.* above, p. 27, n. 3.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks having come up to monks whose robes had been stolen, said: "Your reverences, one whose robe has been stolen or one whose robe has been destroyed is allowed by the lord to ask for a robe from a man or woman householder who is not a relation[1]; your reverences, ask (them) for a robe."

They said: "No, we don't want[2] (one), your reverences, a robe has been obtained by us."

"We are asking for the venerable ones," they said.

"Do ask (them), your reverences."

Then the group of six monks, having approached householders, said:

"Sirs, monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; give them robes," (and) they asked for many robes. At that [213] time a certain man who was sitting in a village assembly hall[3] said to another man:

"Master,[4] monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; I gave them a robe."

Then he said: "I also gave (to them)."

Then another man said: "I also gave (to them)."

These men . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation,[5] ask for many robes? Will the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, deal in the cloth trade[6] or will they set up a shop[7]?"

The monks heard these men who . . . spread it about.

---

[1] Nissag. VI. [2] *alaṃ.* [3] *sabhāyaṃ nisinno.*

[4] *ayyo,* not *ayye,* indicates affection and familiarity along with respect.

[5] They do not care for moderation, do not think of it, or have forgotten it. [6] This is simply a rebuke.

[7] *Cf.* below, p. 113, and *Vin.* ii. 291.

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can the group of six monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many robes ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: " How can you, foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes ? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If a man or a woman householder who is not a relation, asking (a monk), should invite[1] him (to take material for) many robes, then at most (material for) an inner and an upper robe[2] should be accepted as robe-material by that monk; if he should accept more than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Him means: the monk whose robe has been stolen.

A man who is not a relation means: . . . (See Nissag. VI. 3, 1) . . . she who lives in a house.

(*For*) *many robes*[3] means: (for) abundant robes.[3]

Asking, should invite means: he says, " Take just as much as you want."

At most (*material for*) *an inner and an upper robe*

[1] *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 440 for note on this phrase. It is there found that *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* (in spite of the spelling with *-ṭṭh-*) is a gerund from *abhi-har*, like Prakrit *abhihaṭṭuṃ*. This is confirmed by *VA*. 668, *MA*. ii. 264 (on *M*. i. 222)=*AA*. (on *A*. v. 350)=*SA*. iii. 54 (on *S*. iv. 190) which explain *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* by *abhiharitvā*. The phrase *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreti* is followed by the instrumental, the sense of *pavāreti* being to " present with, to supply with, to invite with." Here " to invite " seems the best translation, as the choice of the amount is made to rest with the monk. Also *VA*. 668 says that the term means " to make to like," as well as *nimanteti*, to request, or invite. *C.P.D.* suggests that *abhiharati*+*pavāreti* means to bring out and offer (food, etc.).

[2] *santaruttara* ; see above, p. 12, n. 1.

[3] *bahūhi* . . . *bahukehi*.

should be accepted as robe-material by that monk means: If the three (robes) come to be destroyed, two may be accepted; if two are destroyed, one may be accepted; if one is destroyed nothing may be accepted.

If he should accept more than that means: if he asks for more than that there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having gone up to a householder who is not a relation, this robe material asked for by me more than that (which I should ask for), [**214**] is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.'. . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when is he not a relation (and) asks for robe-material more than that (which he should ask for), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not a relation . . . (See Nissag. VI. **3**, 3) . . . is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, saying: 'I will take the remainder,' taking it he goes away; if they give the remainder, saying: 'Let it be only for you'; if they do not give because (a robe was) stolen[1]; if they do not give because (a robe was) destroyed; if they belong to relations[2]; if they are invited; if it is by means of his own property[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrongdoer. || 3 || **2** ||

---

[1] *VA*. 669, "they give on account of his being learned and so on" (and not because he was robbed).

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 49. [3] *Cf.* above, pp. 27, 49.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time[1] a certain man said to his wife: "I will present[2] master Upananda[3] with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard the words of this man as he was speaking. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit[4]; on a certain occasion a certain man said to his wife: 'I will present master Upananda with a robe.'"

"Your reverence, he is my supporter," he said.

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this man, and having approached he said to this man:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sir, desire to present me with a robe?"

"Did I not also think, master: I will present master Upananda with a robe?"

"If you, sir, desire to present me with a robe, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with one presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then that man . . . spread it about, saying: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with a robe. How can master Upananda, before being invited by me, approaching me, put forward a consideration[5] with regard to a robe?"

---

[1] *Cf.* Nissag. IX.

[2] *acchādeti* has sense of to give so as to clothe or cover.

[3] See also Nissag. VI.

[4] Same thing said to Upananda at *Vin.* i. 300, and iii. 217, 257 (pp. 58, 145, below).

[5] *vikappaṃ āpajjissati.* *Cf.* below, p. 145, where again Upananda is greedy about robes.

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. [215] He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?"

"He is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation[1] does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.[2] Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching a householder who is not a relation, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In case a robe-fund[3] comes to be laid by for a monk by a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his), thinking: 'I will present the monk so and so with a robe, having got the robe in exchange for this robe-fund'—then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: 'Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable one,[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 147.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 39, 44, and below, pp. 59, 147.

[3] *cīvaracetāpana.* A robe-fund consisted of things for barter. This passage is complicated by the various meanings, brought out by the old *Comy.* (see below), which appear to be attached to the cognate forms, °*cetāpana*, °*cetāpanena*, and °*cetāpetvā*. *VA.* 670, *cīvaracetāpanan ti cīvaramūlaṃ.*

[4] *āyasmā*, perhaps here "gentleman"—or "lady"; certainly it is an honorific title. *Cf.* below, p. 148.

having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for this robe-fund, present it to me,' there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

For a monk[1] means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.[2]

A householder means: he who lives in a house.[3]

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.[3]

Robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin[4] or a pearl or a jewel or a coral or a ploughshare[5] or a (piece of) cloth[6] or thread or cotton.

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.[7]

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.[8]

I will present means: I will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-fund comes to be laid by.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): 'What kind of robe do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe shall I get in exchange for you?'

Approaching means: going to the house, approaching (him) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to a

---

[1] *Cf.* this portion of the *Old Comy.* with that on Nissag. IX. and XXVII.

[2] See above, pp. 31, 47.

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 47.

[4] For note on *hirañña*, unwrought gold, and *suvaṇṇa*, wrought gold, see *B.D.* i., p. 28.

[5] *phāla.* At *S.* i. 169, *Sn.*, p. 13 and ver. 77, this means "ploughshare." *Cf. Vin.* i. 225.

[6] *paṭaka* seems connected with *paṭa*.

[7] *paccupaṭṭhita*, present, ready, at hand.

[8] *parivatteti;* also means to turn over, to deal with, to change. *Cf. pārivattakacīvara*, exchange of robes, at p. 39, above. At *Vin.* ii. 174 monks are allowed to barter valuable woollen garments and valuable cotton garments, or cloths, *kambala* and *dussa*, for increasing (the accessories of lodgings).

robe means: 'Let it be long or wide or rough[1] or soft.' [216]

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Like this or like that means: long or wide or rough or soft.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present (*it*) means: give (it).

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If according to what he says, he gets in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe, approaching a householder who was not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to a robe; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration regarding a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the man is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation, there

[1] *appitaṃ*, of a close weave, solid. But, as opposed to "soft," it must here mean harsh or rough. *VA.* 727 explains it by *ghana*, solid, compact, massive. *Cf.* below, p. 145.

is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if they belong to relations,[1] if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if he gets something of small value in exchange while he desires to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

[1] *Cf.* pp. 49, 52.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) IX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time[1] a certain man said to another man: "I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." Then he[2] said: "I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard this conversation of these men. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit; on a certain occasion a [217] certain man said to another man: 'I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe.' Then he[2] said: 'I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans with a robe.'"

'Your reverence, these (men) are my supporters.'

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached these men, and having approached, he said to these men:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sirs, desire to present me with robes?"

"Did we not think, master: 'We will present master Upananda with robes?'"

"If you, sirs, desire to present me with robes, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with ones presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then these men . . . spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with robes. How can master Upananda, before being invited by us, approaching, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

---

[1] *Cf.* Nissag. VIII.

[2] The other man.

Monks heard these men who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Are they relations of yours, Upananda, or not relations?"

"They are not relations, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for those who are not relations.[1] Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching householders who are not relations, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In case various robe-funds come to be laid by for a monk by two men householders or by (two) women householders who are not relations (of his), thinking: 'We will present the monk so and so with robes, having got various robes in exchange for the various robe-funds.' Then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: 'Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable ones, having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for the various robe-funds, present it to me, the two together with one,'[2] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** || [**218**]

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 39, 44, 59.

[2] *ubho'va santā ekenâ ti.* *VA.* says nothing, but see *Old Comy.* below. It means that the two men should combine and put their funds together so that there should be two funds which could then be exchanged for one (good) cloth or robe, and the two men present the monk with one robe.

For a monk[1] means: . . . (See Nissag. VIII. 2, 2) . . . being desirous of presenting to a monk.

By two[2] means: by two.[2]

Men who are not relations means: . . . back through seven generations.[3]

Men householders mean: they who live in a house.

Women householders mean: they who live in a house.

Robe-funds mean: gold or gold coins or pearls or jewels or corals or ploughshares or cloths or threads or cottons.[4]

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

We will present means: we will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-funds have come to be laid by.

Before being invited means: . . . '. . . what kind of robe shall we get in exchange for you?'

Approaching . . . should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe means: 'Let it be long . . .'

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Like this . . . present (it) means: give (it).

The two together with one means: two people for one (robe).[5]

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If, according to what he says, they get in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action . . . (See Nissag. VIII. 2, 1-3; *instead of* a householder who is not a

---

[1] *Cf.* this portion of the *Old Comy.* with that on previous Nissag.

[2] *ubhinnaṃ*, (more properly 'both') . . . *dvinnaṃ*.

[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 39, 44, 54.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 55, where these items are given in the singular, since only one robe-fund is being defined.

[5] *dve pi janā ekena*, two people with one (fine robe instead of with two more ordinary ones).

relation, . . . a householder *read* householders who are not relations . . . householders) . . . if he gets something of small value in exchange while they desire to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || **2** ||

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) X

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a chief minister,[1] the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent a robe-fund[2] by a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying: "Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present master Upananda with a robe."

Then that messenger approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund." [219]

When he had spoken thus, the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund; but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable."[3]

When he had spoken thus, that messenger said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "But is there someone who is the venerable one's attendant[4]?"

At that time a certain lay-follower went to the monastery on some business or other. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, this lay-follower is the monks' attendant."

Then that messenger, informing[5] that lay-follower,

---

[1] *mahāmatta* is at *B.D.* i. 74 included in definition of "kings."

[2] See Nissag. VIII. and IX.

[3] *kappiya—i.e.*, something that is made allowable for the monks to take because it has been given, and so made legally acceptable. See *Vin.* i. 206.

[4] *veyyāvaccakara*, usually a lay-attendant in little better position than a servant. *VA.* 672 explains by *kiccakaro kappiyakārako*, one who makes something legally allowable (to the monks by offering it to them).

[5] *saññapetvā=jānāpetvā*, *VA.* 672.

approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

" Honoured sir, the person whom the venerable one has pointed out as an attendant has been instructed[1] by me; let the venerable one approach (him) at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe."

Then the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: " Let the master make use of this robe; we want this robe made use of by the master."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A second time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: " Let the master make use of . . . by the master." A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A third time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: " Let the master make use of . . . by the master." || 1 ||

Now at that time there came to be a meeting-day for the townspeople,[2] and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes the last pays fifty.[3]

---

[1] *saññatto=āṇatto*, *VA*. 672.

[2] *negamassa samayo hoti*. *Negama* also occurs at *Vin*. i. 268. The word comes from *nigama*, which is from *nadī-gāma*. Originally things were sent by water rather than by land, so that villages on rivers (*nadī-gāma*) would become the centres of trade. In India all important cities are on a river. Thus *nadī-gāma* is an important place, a town even, which may or may not be the seat of a king (*rājadhāni*). If a *gāma*, village, becomes very big, it is called *nagara*, town. If not so big, then it is a *pura*. This is usually a fortified town. Villages and towns run in this order: *gāma*, village; *nigama*, a river-side and hence important village or little town; *pura*, a fortified town, in which kings may live; *nagara*, a town (this may contain a fortified portion, but may spread outside it); *rājadhāni*, seat of a king.

[3] *paññāsaṃ bandho*. Bu. is doubtful of the reading; there is also the *v.l. baddho*, which is synonymous with *jito* or *jīno* below. *VA*. 672 says " the fine (or punishment, *daṇḍa*) is fifty *kahāpaṇas*."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached that lay-follower, and having approached, he said to that lay-follower:

"Sir, I want the robe."

"Honoured sir, wait this day[1] (only). Today there comes to be a meeting-day for the townspeople, and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes last pays fifty."

"Sir, give me the robe this very day,"[2] he said, and he took hold of his waist-band.[3] Then that lay-follower, being pressed by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having got a robe in exchange for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, went the last. People said to this lay-follower: "Why do you, master, come the last? You have lost fifty."[4] Then that lay-follower told this matter to those people. The people . . . spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; [220] amongst them it is not easy to render a service. How can they, being told by a lay-follower: 'Honoured sir, wait this day (only),' not wait?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, being told by a lay-follower: 'Honoured sir, wait this day (only),' not wait?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, being

---

[1] *ajjuṇho*. *VA*. 672 explains by *ajja ekaṃ divasaṃ*. It is therefore more likely to mean "(only) this day (the rest of the present day-and-night)" as given in the *C.P.D.*, than "this moonlight night" of the *P.E.D.*

[2] *ajj' eva*.

[3] *ovaṭṭikāya parāmasi*. *Ovaṭṭikā* can also mean a bracelet and a patch. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 153, n. 3; Morris, *J.P.T.S.*, 1887, p. 156. *Parāmasi*, transld. at *B.D.* i. 203 as "rubs up against" is here explained by *VA*. 672 as *gaṇhi*, took hold.

[4] *paññāsaṃ jino 'si*. Oldenberg, *Vin. Texts* iii. 277 says, "Probably we ought to read *jīno 'si*." *VA*. 672 has the reading *jito 'si*. *Jīyati*, one of whose meanings is "to lose," is in Pali both the passive of √*ji* and the prs. middle of √*jyā* (*jī*), therefore it can have *jita* or *jīna* as past participles.

told by a lay-follower: 'Honoured sir, wait this day (only),' did not wait?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, being told by a lay-follower: 'Honoured sir, wait this day (only),' not wait? Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: || 2 ||

In case a king or one in the service of a king[1] or a brahmin or a householder should send a robe-fund for a monk by a messenger, saying: 'Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present the monk so and so with a robe'; then if this messenger, approaching that monk, should say: 'Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund,' then the messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: 'Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund, but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable.' If this messenger should say to the monk: 'But is there someone who is the venerable one's attendant?', then, monks,[2] an attendant should be pointed out by the monk in need of a robe—either one who is engaged in the monastery[3] or a lay-follower—saying: 'This is the monks' attendant.' If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: 'Honoured

---

[1] *rājabhogga*. *P.E.D.* seems to see in this the meaning of "Of royal power, entitled to the throne, as a designation of class." It says, under art. *bhogga*, and quoting this passage, that *rājabhogga* "takes the place of the usual *khattiya*." I think, however, that the reference is back to the chief minister, who has already appeared in this episode. *Cf.* also below, *Old Comy.*, p. 67.

[2] *Vin. Texts* i. 23, n. 1, "this word of address is most noteworthy. . . . It must be meant as an address by the Buddha himself to the brethren." *Cf.* also *Pāc.* 71, where *bhikkhave* again occurs in the *sikkhāpada*, rule.

[3] *ārāmika*, one who is employed in petty or menial works in a monastery, an attendant in a monastery. Nowadays such a man receives food there.

sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time, (and) he will present you with a robe'; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state[1] and remind him two or three times, saying: 'Sir, I am in need of a robe.' If while stating and reminding two or three times, he succeeds in obtaining[2] that robe, that is good. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should stand silently[3] for it four times, five times, six times at the utmost. If he succeeds in obtaining that robe, standing silently for it, four times, five times, six times at the utmost, [221] that is good. If he, exerting himself[4] further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him,[5] or a messenger should be sent to say: 'That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk.[6] Let the gentlemen make use of their own,[7] let your own things be not lost.'[8] This is the proper course in this case." || 3 || **1** ||

For a monk means: for the good of a monk, making a monk his object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A king means: he who rules a kingdom.

---

[1] *codetabbo*, here to request or state, but "state" is chosen for the translation, since monks were not allowed to make a request.

[2] *abhinipphādeti*.

[3] The silent mode of asking came to be the only one allowed to the monks. But here they are permitted to express their wants in words before they begin their silent standing.

[4] *vāyamamāna*.

[5] According to *VA*. 674 if a monk neither goes himself nor sends a messenger, he falls into an offence of wrong-doing for breaking a custom (*vattabheda*).

[6] *na taṃ tassa bhikkhuno kiñci atthaṃ anubhoti.*

[7] *yuñjant' āyasmanto sakaṃ*, or "let the gentlemen have the benefit of their own things."

[8] *mā vo sakaṃ vinas(s)â ti.*

One in the king's service means: whoever is in the king's pay.[1]

A brahmin means: a brahmin by birth.

A householder means: excepting the king and he who is in the king's service and the brahmin, he who remains is called a householder.[2]

A robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin or a pearl or a jewel.[3]

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present means: give.

If that messenger, approaching that monk, should say: 'Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one, let the venerable one accept this robe-fund,' then this messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: . . . '. . . is the monks' attendant.' He should not say: 'Give it to him,' or 'He will deposit it,' or 'He will barter it,' or 'He will get it in exchange.'

If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: 'Honoured sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe'; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state and remind him two or three times, saying: 'Sir, I am in need of a robe.' He should not say: 'Give me a robe,' 'Fetch me a robe,' 'Barter a robe for me,' 'Get a robe in exchange for me.' A second time he should say . . . A third time he should say . . .

If . . . he succeeds in obtaining (that robe), that is good. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, going there, *he should stand silently for it;* he should not sit down on a seat, he should not accept food, he should not

[1] *raññо bhattavetanāhāro*, living on a salary and food from a king.

[2] *Cf.* earlier definitions of a "householder" as "he who lives in a house," above, pp. 47, 55, 60.

[3] *Cf.* earlier and longer definitions of "robe-fund" at pp. 55, 60.

teach dhamma[1]; being asked, 'Why did you come?' he should say: 'You know it, sir.' If he either sits down on a seat [222] or accepts food or teaches dhamma, he loses an opportunity.[2] A second time he may stand. A third time he may stand. Having stated four times, he may stand four times. Having stated five times, he may stand twice. Having stated six times, he may not stand.[3] || 1 ||

If he, exerting himself further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an

[1] *na dhammo bhāsitabbo.* *VA.* 673 says that if asked to recite a piece of the text (or a blessing, at the beginning of a ceremony) or a grace (at the end of a meal), he should not say anything.

[2] *ṭhānaṃ bhañjati*—*i.e.*, to go and stand. *VA.* 673 *ṭhānaṃ*= *āgatakāraṇaṃ*—*i.e.*, the reason or occasion for which he came (namely, to acquire a robe).

[3] The method of reckoning the stating and standing is complicated. In the first place it is curious that here the monk seems able to state up to six times, while above, p. 66, it was said that he may state up to two or three times. According to *VA.* 674 there are three statings and three standings, and an increase in the one means a decrease in the other so far as asking for it four times goes. Here it means (so *VA.*) that if there is a decrease of one stating there is an increase of two standings. Therefore a double standing is shown to be the sign (*lakkhaṇa*) of one stating. So, by this reckoning, stating up to three times, there may be standing up to six times. Stating twice, there may be standing up to eight times. (This must be because there might have been one more stating, three statings allowing six standings, but because there are here only two statings, two more standings may be added, making eight.) Stating once, there may be standing up to ten times. (Here there might have been two more statings=eight standings. This, with the one more stating that was legal and its two standings, makes altogether ten standings.) Inasmuch as stating up to six times there should be no standing, so standing up to twelve times there should be no stating. Therefore if he states but does not stand, six statings are required. If he stands but does not state, twelve standings are required. If he stands and asks, for each stating two standings should be omitted. This is Bu.'s contribution to the subject. It seems that if a monk stands and speaks, saying that he wants a robe, he must lose two "standings"—*i.e.*, two opportunities to stand for a robe.

individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe obtained by me, by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him, or a messenger should be sent to say: 'That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk. Let the gentlemen make use of their own, let your own things be not lost.' This is the proper course[1] *in this case* means: this is the appropriate course[1] in this case. || 2 ||

If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking that they are more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, but is in doubt (as to the number of times), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he is in doubt (as to the number), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be less, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence in stating three times, in standing six times; in stating less than three times, in standing

[1] "proper course" is *sāmīci*, etiquette, courtesy; "appropriate course" is *anudhammatā*, custom; used with regard to the monks. *Dhamma* here means good social manners and customs. *Anudhammatā* is a synonym for *sāmīci*.

less than six times; if himself not stating, he gives; if stating, the owners give; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 4 || 2 ||

The First Division: that on Kaṭhina-cloth[1]

This is its key[2]:

Ten (nights), one night, and a month, and washing, acceptance,
Three about those who are not relations, of two, and by means of a messenger. [223]

[1] *kaṭhinavagga*. *Cf.* the *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka*, *Vin.* i. 253-265.

[2] *uddāna*, something like a mnemonic verse, an abbreviation, in which only a leading word of each rule is given, and simply to help the memory of the monk who is reciting the rules. All the teaching was oral.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XI

. . . at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī.[1] At that time the group of six monks, approaching silk-makers,[2] said: "Sirs, hatch[3] many silk-worms, and give them to us, for we want to make a rug[4] mixed with silk." These looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, approaching us, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . mixed with silk'? It is a loss for us, it is ill-gotten for us that we, for the sake of livelihood, for the sake of wife and children, are bringing (these) many small creatures into destruction."

Monks heard these men who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, approaching silk-makers, say: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk'?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, approaching silk-makers, spoke thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk'?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, approaching silk-makers, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk'? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those

---

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 247.
[2] *kosiyakāraka*, those preparing the raw silk, raising silk-worms (*kosakāraka*), rather than silk-weavers.
[3] *pacatha*, lit. boil or cook.
[4] *santhata*, something that is spread: a rug, mat or a sheet. See Intr., p. xxii.

who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monks should cause a rug to be made mixed with silk, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.[1]

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made mixing it with one silken filament,[2] there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . 'Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made mixed with silk, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.' || 1 || [224]

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If what was incompletely executed by others, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, acquiring what was made for another, he

[1] *I.e.*, having spread out the material, or by the spreading method; see Intr., p. xxii.

[2] *amsu* is really the technical name of those small particles of which a thread is composed, not the thread itself.

makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1]

There is no offence if he makes a canopy[2] or a ground-covering[3] or a screen-wall[4] or a mattress[5] or a squatting mat[6]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 || 2 ||

[1] =below, *Vin.* iii. 227, 229, 233, and *Vin.* iv. 167, 171.

[2] Nowadays a canopy would be used for putting over shrines.

[3] *Cf.* p. 46, above.

[4] Such as a wall made up of cloth. Word occurs at *Vin.* iii. 189, iv. 269, *Jā.* ii. 88.

[5] *bhisi*; see above, p. 47.

[6] *bimbohana*, such as monks in Ceylon use nowadays in the hall where the *uposatha* is held and the *upasampadā* conferred. They are usually padded. These items recur below at pp. 78, 82, 89, and *Vin.* iv. 171, 279.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XII

. . . at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Peaked Roof. At that time the group of six monks had a rug[1] made of pure black sheep's[2] wool. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, seeing them . . . spread it about, saying: " How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses ?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the group of six monks have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool ? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should cause a rug to be made of pure black sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** ||

---

[1] *santhata*, see above, p. 71, n. 4.

[2] *eḷaka*, a ram, a wild goat, according to *P.E.D* and Childers. *Eḍaka* (Skrt.) is a kind of sheep, a ram, a wild goat, according to Monier-Williams. *Aja* is certainly a goat. The compound *aj-eḷaka* sometimes occurs, as at *D.* i. 5, seeming to mean the goats and the sheep. In India, the goat and the sheep closely resemble one another: the tails of the former stick up, those of the latter hang down; but the colour and texture of their hair, or wool (*loma*), are similar.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Black means: there are two (kinds of) black: black by nature or dyed black.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven. [225]

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . '. . . this rug which I, honoured sirs, had made of pure black sheep's wool . . .' . . . if he is the first wrong-doer.[1] ||2||

[1] *Cf.* Nissag. XI.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks said: "It is forbidden by the lord to have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool."[1] And these, taking only a little white for the seam,[2] all the same[3] had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, taking . . . pure black sheep's wool? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When a new rug is being made for a monk, two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours.[4]

---

[1] Nissag. XII.

[2] *anta.* *VA.* 684, "applying (or bringing) white to it, making as it were a border at the edge (*anta*) of the sheet."

[3] *tath' eva*, or "as before."

[4] *gocariyānan ti kapilavaṇṇānaṃ*, *VA.* 684, which seems to indicate "the colour of oxen," although *cariya* does not mean *vaṇṇa*, colour. *Vin. Texts* i. 25, n. 2, says, "This is deliberately chosen as an ugly mixture, which would lessen the commercial value of the rug." It might also be a preventive of unsuitable pride in a fine article. But I think that this rule should be regarded as a continuation of the previous one (Nissag XII), expanding it, and

If a monk should cause a new rug to be made not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** ||

New means: it is so called with reference to the making.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.[1]

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

Two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken means: being brought, two *tulā* weights[2] may be taken.

The third of white means: a *tulā* weight of white.

The fourth of reddish brown colours means: a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours. [**226**]

If a monk . . . not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours means: if he makes or causes a new rug to be made not taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug which I caused to be made not taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let them give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself . . . (See Nissag. XI. 2, 2) . . . he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours; if he

giving the detail necessary for carrying it out properly. The monks had nothing to do with the "commercial value" of things, but it was important that they should not behave like those leading the household life.

[1] See above, p. 72, n., and p. 75.

[2] *tulā*, lit. balance, a measure of weight.

makes it taking more of white, more of reddish brown colours; if he makes it taking only of white, only of reddish brown colours; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat[1]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || **2** ||

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 73, and notes.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks had a rug made every year. They were intent on begging, intent on hinting,[1] saying: "Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool." People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool'? For, (although) our children soil and wet them[2] and they are eaten by rats, our rugs once made last for five or six years. But these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year; they are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool.'"

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can monks have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '. . . we want sheep's wool'?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. [227] He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, have a rug made every year, that you are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '. . . we want sheep's wool'?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting . . . '. . . we want sheep's wool'? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A new rug which a monk has had made should be

---

[1] =*B.D.* i. 246.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 129.

used for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: "Let the revered sir[1] come, we will nurse (him)." Monks spoke thus: "Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you." He said:

"Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that a new rug which a monk has had made should be used for six years; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking a rug, and without a rug there comes to be no comfort for me. I will not go."

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement as to a rug.[2] And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, am ill; I am not able to set out taking a rug. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement as to a rug.' A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill. He is not able to set

---

[1] *bhaddanto*. *Cf.* above, p. 13 ff., where an ill monk is allowed to travel without his three robes, if he has the formal agreement of the Order to be regarded as not away, separated from them.

[2] *santhata-sammuti*. *VA*. 685 says that he may have a new rug made at the place to which he goes (thereby not waiting for the six years to elapse). *Cf.* Nissag. II.

out taking a rug. He requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk so and so the agreement as to a rug. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. [228] This monk . . . requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. The Order gives to the monk so and so the agreement as to a rug. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement as to a rug is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it does not seem right, they should speak. Agreement as to a rug is given by the Order to the monk so and so; it is pleasing . . . So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A new rug which a monk has had made should last for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **2** ||

New means: . . . not woven.

Has had made means: making or causing to be made.

Should be used for six years means: it should be used for six years at the minimum.

If within six years means: in less than six years.

Getting rid of . . . that (former) rug means: giving it to others.

Not getting rid of means: not giving it to anyone.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks, if he makes or causes another new rug to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made for me less than six years ago without the agreement of the monks, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . should give back . . . let the

venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture . . . if he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.[1]

There is no offence if he makes one after six years; if he makes one after more than six years; if he makes it or causes it to be made for another; if, acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat[2]; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || **3** || [229]

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 72.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 73.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then the lord addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I want to go into solitary retreat for three months. I am not to be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food."[1]

"Very well, lord," these monks answered the lord, and accordingly no one here went up to the lord except the one who brought the alms-food. Now at that time an agreement was made by the Order at Sāvatthī, saying: "Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess[2] an offence of expiation."

Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta,[3] approached the lord together with his followers, and having approached and greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks. The lord said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, as he was sitting at a respectful distance:

"Upasena, I hope things go well with you, I hope

---

[1] At *S.* v. 325 the lord dwelt in solitude for three months; at *Vin.* iii. 68, *S.* v. 12, 320 for two weeks. [2] *desāpetabbo.*

[3] Referred to at *Vin.* i. 59, *Jā.* ii. 449 for ordaining his *saddhivihārika* only a year after his own ordination. At *A.* i. 24 he is called chief among those who are altogether charming (*samantapāsādika*, also title of *VA.*). Both these points are referred to at *Pss. Breth.* 261 f. He was younger brother to Sāriputta, and had three sisters, Cālā, Upacālā, Sīsupacālā, their mother being Rūpasārī, and his father Vaṅganta; *cf. DhA.* ii. 84, where Sāriputta's father is also said to be Vaṅganta; and *Pss. Sisters*, p. 96, where the three sisters are said to be junior to Sāriputta. See also *Thag.* 576, *Ap.* i. 62 for his verses; *Ud.* 46, where he says that he is of great psychic power and majesty; and see *D.P.P.N.*

you are keeping going, I hope you have come here with but little fatigue on the journey ?"

"Lord, things go well with us, lord, we keep ourselves going, we have come here with but little fatigue on the journey, lord."

Now at that time the monk who was the fellow-resident of the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, was sitting not far from the lord. Then the lord said to this monk: "Monk, are rag-robes pleasing to you ?"

"Rag-robes are not pleasing to me, lord," he said.

"Then how is it, monk, that you are one who wears rag-robes ?"

"Lord, my preceptor is one who wears rag-robes, therefore am I also one who wears rag-robes." Then the lord said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta:

"And is this crowd[1] agreeable to you, Upasena ? How is it that you lead[2] the crowd, Upasena ?"

He said: "Lord, I say to whoever asks me for the upasampadā ordination: 'Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman,[3] one who wears rag-robes.[4] If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes, then will I confer the upasampadā ordination upon you.' If he promises me, I confer the upasampadā ordination, but if he does not promise me I do not confer the upasampadā ordination. [230] I say to whoever asks me for help[5]: 'Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes. If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes, then I will give you help.' If he promises me, I give help; but if he does not promise me, I do not give help. Thus do I, lord, lead the crowd." || 1 ||

---

[1] *parisā*. [2] *vinesi*.

[3] *piṇḍapātika*. This I think is a word that may be correctly rendered by "almsman," "beggar for alms." See *B.D.* i., Intr. xli, and *Vism.* 66.

These three *aṅga* (practices) are explained in detail at *Vism.* 59 ff. Sometimes combined with *tecīvarika*, a wearer of the three robes, as, *e.g.*, at *Vin.* i. 253, *M.* i. 214. [5] *nissaya*.

" Good, Upasena, good; it is good, Upasena, that you lead the crowd. But do you know, Upasena, of the Order's agreement at Sāvatthī ?"

" Lord, I do not know the Order's agreement at Sāvatthī."

" At Sāvatthī, Upasena, an agreement was made by the Order: ' Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess an offence of expiation.' "

" Lord, the Order at Sāvatthī will be well known for its own agreement; we will not lay down what is not (yet) laid down, nor will we abolish what has been laid down, but we will dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down."

" That is very good, Upasena; what is not (yet) laid down should not be laid down, nor should what is laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down. Upasena, I allow those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robes to come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to."

At that time several monks[1] who came to be standing outside the gateway,[2] said: " We will make the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, confess to an offence of expiation." Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, rising up from his seat with his followers, greeting the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then those monks said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta: " Do you, reverend Upasena, know of the Order's agreement at Sāvatthī ?"

" But, your reverences, the lord said to me: ' But do you know of the Order's agreement at Sāvatthī ? . . . according to the rules of training which have been laid

[1] *sambahulā bhikkhū*, see above, p. 8, n. 6.
[2] *dvārakoṭṭhaka*, or the (store-)room over or by the gate.

down.' Your reverences, it is allowed by the lord, who said: 'Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robes may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.' "

Then these monks said: "What the venerable Upasena says is true; what has not yet been laid down should not be laid down, nor should what has been laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down." || 2 ||

Then monks heard: "They say it was allowed by the lord, saying: 'Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robes may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.'" These, longing for a sight of the lord, discarding their rugs,[1] [**231**] took upon themselves the practice of jungle-dwellers, the practice of those who are almsmen, the practice of those who wear rag-robes.[2] Then the lord as he was engaged in touring the lodgings together with several monks,[3] saw here and there discarded rugs, and seeing them, he addressed the monks, saying:

"How is it, monks, that there are these discarded rugs here and there?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then

---

[1] See above, p. 71, n. 4. It is on this passage that *VA.* 687 says "their *santhata* (rugs) counting as a fourth robe." Reference to a fourth robe, *catutthaka cīvara,* is made at *Vism.* 65, to be worn principally apparently for the purpose of washing and dyeing the three usual robes, and as either an inner or an outer robe.

[2] These three *aṅgas* appear as *dhūtaguṇa* (together with that of *sapadānacārika,* continuous alms-begging) at *Vin.* iii. 15 (=*B.D.* i. 26), and together with others at *Vism.* 59 ff. *Cf.* also *Vin.* i. 253, ii. 299 (with *tecīvarika*) and *Vin.* ii. 32. At *A.* iii. 391 the three ways of living given in *Vin.* above occur with *gāmantavihārī,* one who dwells in village-outskirts, *nemantanika,* the guest, and *gahapaticīvaradhara,* the wearer of robes given by a householder. If any one of these does not behave suitably he is *ten'aṅgena gārayho,* blameworthy as to that attribute (which he has taken on himself)—*aṅga* being a technical term covering these various modes of scrupulous living.

[3] See above, p. 8, n. 6.

the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks based on ten grounds: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order . . .[1] . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When, (with the addition of part of) a rug, (a piece of) cloth to sit upon[2] is being made for a monk, (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span[3] must be taken from all round an old rug in order to disfigure[4] it. If a monk should have made (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 3 || 1 ||

A (piece of) cloth to sit upon means: it is so called if it has a border.[5]

---

[1] =*Vin.* iii. 21 (*B.D.* i. 37 f.); *A.* i. 98, 100; v. 70.

[2] "Rug" and "piece of cloth to sit upon" are *nisīdana-santhata*; transld. at *Vin. Texts* i. 25 as "a rug to sit upon," and at i. 26 as "seat-rug," as though only one article were meant, which was probably the case, although two were involved in the making. For *Old Comy.* defines *nisīdana* and *santhata* separately below; also *santhata* has occurred alone in Nissag. XI-XIV. At *Vin.* iv. 123 *nisīdana* appears among other requisites, while at *Vin.* iv. 170-171 directions are given as to the size a *nisīdana* is to be made; at *Vin.* i. 295 a *nisīdana* is allowed as a protection for body, robes and lodgings; at *Vin.* i. 297 it is one of the things allowed to be allotted but not assigned. At *Vin.* ii. 123 the six monks were separated from their *nisīdana* for four months, which led to a prohibition. It thus seems to be the thing sat upon and not the occasion of sitting upon something. Huber, *J.As.* 1913, p. 37 (=497) translates *nisīdanasaṃstara* as "tapis," while for *santhata*, alone, he has "couverture." Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, p. 21, has "piece of carpet made into a seat," while for the Tibetan equivalent for *santhata* alone, he gives "mat." On *santhata*, see Intr., p. xxii, and *cf.* *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa*, above, p. 34, and *Vin.* i. 295.

[3] *sugatavidatthī*, see *B.D.* i. 253.

[4] *dubbaṇṇakaraṇāya*, occurring also below, p. 407, in Pāc. LVIII.

[5] *sadasaṃ vuccati*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 123, 171. *Sadasa=sa+dasā.* At *Vin.* ii. 301-307 we get the opposite (adj.), *adasaka*, again qualifying *nisīdana*, and where an unbordered, *adasaka*, *nisīdana* is not

A rug means: it is made " having spread," not woven.[1]
Is being made means: making or causing to be made.
Old rug means: dressed in it once, put on once.[2]

(A piece) the breadth of the accepted span must be taken from all round in order to disfigure it means: cutting a circle or square so that it may become firm,[3] it should be " spread " in one quarter or it should be " spread " having been unravelled.

If a monk . . . without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug means: if without having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, he makes or has made, (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this (piece of) cloth to sit upon having been made (with the addition of part of) a rug, (but) without having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back to the venerable one.'

---

allowed (even if it is of the right size). At *Vin.* iv. 170, 171 the right size is prescribed for the *nisīdana*, a border is allowed, and it is said that this border should be a span; if these measurements are exceeded the *nisīdana* should be cut down (to the proper size) on acquisition. At the Council of Vesālī, *Vin.* ii. 294 ff., it is said that a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border is not allowable, because a monk who had one of this nature would incur the pācittiya offence involving cutting down (*i.e.*, Pāc. LXXXIX), *Vin.* ii. 307. All the ten matters, *vatthu*, whose allowability is being questioned at the Council are explained, see *Vin.* ii. 300 f., except this one and the one concerning gold and silver (Nissag. XVIII).

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 72, 75, 77.

[2] =definition of soiled, or old, robe, above, p. 32. Thus the words used are those which usually refer to the putting on of the set of three robes: *nivattha* and *pāruta*. But Bu. at *VA.* 687, in explaining their meaning in the above passage, defines them as *nisinna* and *nipanna* respectively, sat on and lain on. See Intr., p. xxiv.

[3] *thirabhāvāya.*

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. . . . (See Nissag. XI. **2**, 2). . . . if he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug; [**232**] if, failing to get it, he makes it having taken a smaller (piece)[1]; if, failing to get it, he makes it not having taken (any portion)[2]; if acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || **2** ||

[1] *alabhanto thokataraṃ ādiyitvā karoti.* Bu. is silent.
[2] *alabhanto anādiyitvā karoti.*
[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 73, 75, 78, 82 ; and *Vin.* iv. 171 ff.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time as a certain monk was in the country of the Kosalas[1] going to Sāvatthī, (some) sheep's wool[2] accrued[3] (to him) on the way. Then that monk went along tying up that sheep's wool into a bundle with his upper robe.[4] People, seeing this monk, made fun of him, saying: "For how much have you bought (it), honoured sir, how great will the profit become?"

This monk, being made fun of by these people, became ashamed.[5] Then that monk, going to Sāvatthī, threw down[6] the sheep's wool even as he was standing.[7] Monks said to this monk: "Why do you, your reverence, throw down this sheep's wool even as you are standing?"

"Because I, your reverences, was made fun of by (some) people on account of this sheep's wool."

"But from how far have you, your reverence, conveyed this sheep's wool?"

"For more than three yojanas,[8] your reverences," he

---

[1] Sāvatthī was the capital of the Kosala country.

[2] *eḷakalomāni.*

[3] *uppajjiṃsu ; uppajjati* is usually "arises, is produced, is born"; *cf.* above, pp. 4, 24, below, pp. 99, 153.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 37.

[5] *maṅku,* lit. staggered or shocked. See *A.* v., p. v.

[6] *āsumbhi.*

[7] *ṭhitako 'va. VA.* 687 says, "as men bringing a large burden of wood from the jungle, being weary, let it drop (*pātenti*) even as they are standing (*ṭhitakā 'va*), so he let it drop."

[8] See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 16, for "Tabulated Statement of Passages on the length of the Yojana." His tentative conclusion is that in fifth-century Pali literature the yojana means between seven and eight miles. Childers reckoned twelve miles to a yojana. See also E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha as Legend . . .*, 1927, p. 17. An ascending scale of measures of length is given at *VbhA.* 343.

said. Then those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can this monk convey sheep's wool for more than three yojanas?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, conveyed sheep's wool for more than three yojanas?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, convey sheep's wool for more than three yojanas? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Sheep's wool may accrue to a monk as he is going along a road. It may be accepted by that monk, if he likes; but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the utmost, if there are no carriers. If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** || [**233**]

To a monk as he is going along a road means: as he is going on a roadway.[1]

Sheep's wool may accrue means: it may accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend or as rag-robes or by means of his own property.[2]

If he likes means: if he wishes.

It may be accepted . . . but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the utmost means: it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the maximum.

If there are no carriers means: if there is no one who is a carrier, neither a woman nor a man, nor a householder nor one who has gone forth.

If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers means: if he makes the first foot go beyond three yojanas, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot go beyond, there is an

[1] *pantha.*

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 27.

offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If standing within three yojanas he lets it drop beyond the three yojanas, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond three yojanas, placing it in a vehicle or a bundle of another (person) without (his) knowing it, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, made by me to go beyond three yojanas, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas thinking them to be more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt, he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less than three yojanas when it is more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than three yojanas, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less than three yojanas when it is less, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he conveys it for three yojanas; if he conveys it for less than three yojanas; if he conveys it for three yojanas and conveys it back; if desiring a habitation, going three yojanas, he conveys it beyond that[1]; if he conveys something stolen that he has got back[2]; if he conveys something destroyed that he has

[1] *VA.* 688 says, "going where he is unable to receive the recitation and interrogation (of the Pātimokkha) or necessities and so on, he goes elsewhere beyond that. Elsewhere beyond that means, there is no offence in so conveying it for a hundred yojanas."

[2] *VA.* 688, "thieves stealing it (from him), knowing its uselessness give it back." This means that thieves took his sheep's wool when he had done perhaps two and a half yojanas; he retraces his steps and they return him the wool as it is of no value for them;

got back; if he makes another convey goods tied up in a bundle[1]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

he goes a yojana in order to reach his vihāra. Thus he would have done three and a half yojanas, but the part of the journey due to the robbing incident does not count.

[1] *katabhaṇḍa* ; *cf.* below, p. 98. *VA.* 689 says " goods tied up (*kataṃ bhaṇḍam*) in a blanket, fleecy cover, sheet and so on, anything even if it is tied up only with a thread."

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVII

. . . among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.[1] At that time the group of six monks had sheep's wool [234] washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns, through washing, dyeing, combing the sheep's wool, neglected[2] the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight.[3] Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid approached the lord, and having approached, greeting the lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

" Gotami, I hope that the nuns are zealous, ardent, (with) a self that is striving ?"[4]

---

[1] Besides the Nigrodhārāma at Kapilavatthu, there was another at Rājagaha, mentioned, *e.g.*, at *D.* ii. 116. *D.P.P.N.* says that the one at Kapilavatthu was given to the Order by a Sakyan named Nigrodha. If the evidence for this were stronger, it would have to be translated " Nigrodha's monastery."

[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 190, where these same five items are again connected with *riñcati*, to neglect.

[3] *adhisīla*, *adhicitta*, *adhipaññā*, given at *D.* iii. 219 as the " three trainings." The descriptions given at *A.* i. 235 and of *adhicittam-anuyutta* at *A.* i. 254 ff. to my mind make it quite clear that *adhi-* points to the higher states of morality, thought and insight, and therefore should not be translated, as would also be possible, by " as to " morality, etc. E. M. Hare, at *G.S.* iii. 310, translates " further virtue, further thought, further insight." Moreover the exposition and the interrogation were not " as to " morality, thought and insight. The exposition (*uddesa*) was the recital of the Pātimokkha rules, and the interrogation (*paripuccha*) was the asking of all present at the fortnightly recitals if they had seen, heard or suspected any offence.

[4] *pahitatta*. I take this translation from Mrs. Rhys Davids's *Birth of Indian Psychology, etc.*, p. 347, " the self bedriven "; p. 350, " the man who is *pahitatto*, he who has the self that has striven." The commentarial exegesis is usually, if not always, *pesitatta*, the self

"Whence, lord, is there zeal in the nuns? The masters, the group of six monks, have sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns . . . neglect the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight."

Then the lord . . . gladdened Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid with dhamma-talk. Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid . . . gladdened by the lord with dhamma-talk, greeting the lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the lord, in this connection, on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the group of six monks:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

"Were they relations of yours, monks, or not relations?"

"They were not relations, lord," they said.

"Foolish men, those who are not relations do not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant to those who are not relations. Thus you, foolish men, will have sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns who are not relations? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should have sheep's wool washed or dyed or combed by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[1] || **1** ||

Whatever[2] means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

expunged, an exegesis in line with the editors' desire for cessation and waning of the individual self. They were wrongly, though possibly deliberately, deriving *pahitatta* from *pahiṇati*, to send, instead of from *padahati*, to strive.

[1] *Cf.* Nissag. IV, which is referred to under the name of *purāṇacīvarasikkhāpada* at *VA*. 689.

[2] From here to end of this Nissag., *cf.* Nissag. IV. **2**, 2.

(A nun) who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Wash means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.[1]

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Comb means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If combed [**235**] it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, caused by me to be washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he

[1] In the plural, since animals' hair or wool, *lomāni*, is thought of as a plural in Pali.

thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb, makes her wash sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is not a relation . . . If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation . . . If he makes her wash another's sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if a female relation is washing it

when a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked; if he makes her wash unused goods tied up in a bundle[1]; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || **2** ||

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 93, on *katabhaṇḍa*.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 34.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVIII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time [236] the venerable Upananda,[1] the son of the Sakyans, was dependent as a regular diner on a certain family in Rājagaha. When solid food or soft food came to[2] that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Now at that time meat came one evening to that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. A young boy belonging to that family, getting up in the night towards morning, cried: "Give me meat." Then the man spoke thus to his wife:

"Give the boy the master's portion, having got another (portion) in exchange, we will give that to the master."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, dressing in the morning and taking his bowl and robe, approached the family, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; having approached, having greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting at a respectful distance, that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Yesterday evening, honoured sir, (some) meat came, a portion from that was set aside for the master. This young boy, honoured sir, got up in the night towards morning and cried: 'Give me meat,' and the master's

---

[1] See above, p. 42, below, p. 109.

[2] *uppajjati*, *cf.* above, pp. 4, 24, 90, below, p. 153.

portion was given to the boy. What could you get with a *kahāpaṇa*,[1] honoured sir ?"

" (The use of) *kahāpaṇas* is given up by me, sir," he said.

" Yes, honoured sir, it is given up."

" Nevertheless give me a *kahāpaṇa*, sir," he said.

Then that man having given the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, a *kahāpaṇa*, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" As we accept gold and silver,[2] so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver."

---

[1] The monetary unit in Pali literature. It is one of the items in the *Old Comy.'s* definition of *rajata*, silver, below, and of *rūpiya*, perhaps gold and silver, or perhaps another word for silver, in the next Nissag. Since the word *rūpiya* is used in this story, presumably the *kahāpaṇa* of *rūpiya* is meant above. See next notes. *VA.* 689 says that the *kahāpaṇa* is *suvaṇṇamayo vā rūpiyamayo vā pākatiko vā*, made of gold or made of silver (or gold and silver), or the ordinary one. This last was probably usually made of copper. *VA.* 297 says that in Rājagaha a *kahāpaṇa* was (worth) twenty *māsakas* (beans), therefore a *pāda* was worth five *māsakas*, and in all districts a *pāda* was a quarter of a *kahāpaṇa*. This passage opposes the old black *kahāpaṇa* (*porāṇa nīlakahāpaṇa*) to others, presumably more modern ones, such as those of Rudradāmaka, which, according to the Ṭīkā, were worth a third of the *nīlakahāpaṇa*. In one of the *Comys*. Bu. calls the *kahāpaṇa* four-sided, thus not circular.

On *kahāpaṇa* see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, pp. 3, 13; *Buddhist India*, p. 100; *B.D.* i. 29, 71, n. 2; and on *pāda*, *māsaka*, see *B.D.* i. 71, n. 2; 72, n. 1. The late Professor E. J. Rapson kindly told me that *coins* were certainly known at the time of the *Commentaries*, but it is doubtful whether they were known at the date of the text. *Cf.* A. A. Macdonell, *India's Past*, 262 f.; Rapson, *Ancient India*, 13-4, 151-2, 173; *C.H.I.* i. 61, 217. Here we have to bear in mind a distinction between the text (*sikkhāpada*), the *Old Comy.* (*Padabhājaniya*) and the *Commentary* (Buddhaghosa). The two former may have sustained several redactions.

[2] *rūpiya*, silver, or gold and silver. In the " rule " *rūpiya* disappears and is supplanted by the compound, *jātarūparajata*. It is not unusual for a " rule " to be more precise in its reference than the story that led up to it, so that here, had only " silver " been intended in the story, it would not have been surprising to find the rule improving on the story, and alluding to " gold and silver." But both the *Old Comy.* and *VA.* appear to equate *rūpiya* with *jātarūparajata*, as though at all events at their date the two meant the same thing.

Jātarūpa is a word for gold, perhaps meaning lit. a form, *rūpa*,

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, accepted gold and silver?"

" It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

" How can you, foolish man, accept gold and silver?

(stamped) on what is good and sound. The *Old Comy.* below defines it as *satthuvaṇṇa*, the colour of the teacher (*cf. D.* ii. 17, iii. 143); *VA.* 689 as *suvaṇṇassa nāma*, and says that it is like the colour of the tathāgata (*cf. DA.* i. 78, *suvaṇṇa*). Thus *jātarūpa* seems to be called *suvaṇṇa* on account of its lovely colour.

Rajata is defined in the *Old Comy.* below (also at *DA.* 78) as " *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, of wood, of lac, used in business "; at *VA.* 689 as " mother-of-pearl, precious stone, coral, silver (*rajata*), gold (*jātarūpa*).

Rūpiya is defined in the *Old Comy.* on the next Nissag. as " the colour of the teacher, the *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, of wood, of lac, used in business." This definition therefore combines those of *jātarūpa* and of *rajata* under the one heading, as though *rūpiya* were a generic term for these two precious metals. *Cf. VA.* 696, where *jātarūparajata* seems identified with *rūpiya*, and where also Bu. defines *rūpiyasaṃvohāraṃ* as *jātarūparajataparivattanaṃ*, the *rūpiya* used in business in exchange of gold and silver.

I have, in view of these definitions, translated both *rūpiya* and *jātarūparajata* (of the " rule ") as " gold and silver." Whether all or any of these were simply pieces of metal, or coins as we know them, stamped and engraved with a figure or form, *rūpa*, as in Bu.'s days seems at least to have been the case with some of the *māsakas* (see below, p. 102, nn. 9, 10), we cannot, for the time to which the text and *Old Comy.* purport to refer, determine with any certainty. *Rūpiya* certainly signifies a medium of exchange, but yet it would be a mistake to translate it by " money." See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 7, where he seems to reject the idea that *rūpiya* means money. The bowls that were *rūpiyamaya*, used by the group of six monks, could not have been " made of money." On the other hand, they also had bowls that were *sovaṇṇamaya*, made of gold, gold of the kind that is *suvaṇṇa*. It therefore looks as if in this passage *rūpiya* does not stand for silver as well as for gold, nor for " silver " as a medium of exchange. Again, taking *A.* i. 253 to show how far from fixed were the meanings attached to these names for precious metals, *jātarūpa* clearly represents unworked, sterling gold that a goldsmith can work into ornaments.

It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should take gold and silver,[1] or should get another to take it (for him), or should consent to its being kept in deposit[2] (for him), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 || [237]

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Gold[3] means: it is called the colour of the teacher.[4]

Silver[5] means: the *kahāpaṇa*,[6] the *māsaka*[7] of copper,[8] the *māsaka* of wood,[9] the *māsaka* of lac,[10] used in business.[11]

---

[1] *jātarūparajata*. *Cf.* next note above. At *Vin.* i. 245 the lord is recorded to say, "I do not say, monks, that in any way may gold and silver be consented to, may be looked about for." The Cūḷavagga, in the account of the Council of Vesālī, *Vin.* ii. 294 ff., includes the acceptance of gold and silver (*jātarūparajata*) by monks as the last of the ten matters questioned, but ruled not to be permissible. At *D.* i. 5 an ordinary man might say of Gotama that he is one who refrains from accepting *jātarūparajata*.

[2] *upanikkhittaṃ vā sādiyeyya*. See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 7, and *Vin. Texts* i. 26, n. 4.

[3] *jātarūpa*. [4] *satthuvaṇṇa*. [5] *rajata*.

[6] See *B.D.* i. 28, n. 1; 71, n. 2; and above, p. 100, n. 1.

[7] See *B.D.* i. 71, n. 2, and p. 72.

[8] *lohamāsaka*. *VA.* 689 says that it is a *māsaka* (bean) made up of copper and bronze (*tamba*), etc.

[9] *dārumāsaka*. *VA.* 689 says that this is a *māsaka* made up of strong, durable wood, or of a piece of bamboo, or even of palm leaves, cutting a figure or engraving into it (*rūpaṃ chinditvā*).

[10] *jatumāsaka*. *VA.* 690 says that this is a *māsaka* made with lac or with resin, on to which a figure has been embossed or introduced (lit. caused to be raised up *samuṭṭhāpetvā*).

It is interesting to note the present-day usage in force in some parts of Tibet: J. Hanbury-Tracy, *Black River of Tibet*, p. 73, "a collection of shells, short lengths of polished wood with curious markings, bean-pods and round discs. These were the tallies used in tax-collecting." And p. 74, "in some parts of Tibet lumps of silver, in the shape of ponies' hooves, are used for money."

[11] *ye vohāraṃ gacchanti*. *VA.* 690 says that in all districts where there is business every kind is included, even if made of bone, of hide, of fruit, of seeds of trees, or whether a figure has been raised

Should take means: if he himself takes, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should get another to take it (*for him*) means: if he causes another to take it, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should consent to its being kept in deposit means: if he says: 'Let this come to be for the master,' or consents to its being kept in deposit, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, accepted gold and silver,[1] this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.'[2] Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there, he should be told: 'Sir, find out about this.' If he says: 'What could be got with this?' he should not be told: 'Bring this or that'; oil or ghee or honey or molasses may be mentioned as allowable. If he brings what is allowable, having got it in exchange for this, it may be made use of by all except the one who accepted the gold and silver. If he can undertake to do this in this way,[3] it is well. But if he cannot undertake to do it, he

up on it or not. This passage goes on to say that the things which involve forfeiture are silver, gold, a gold *māsaka*, a silver *māsaka*; the things that involve an offence of wrong-doing are pearls and other gems, the seven sorts of grain, slaves, fields, flower-parks and orchards; the things that are allowable include thread, a ploughshare, cloth, cotton, cooked pulses, and oil, ghee, butter, honey, molasses as medicine.

[1] *rūpiya*.

[2] *VA*. 691 points out that as *rūpiya* is not legally allowed (*akappiya*), neither a group nor an individual may possess it, but only the Order. Therefore it can only be forfeited to the Order.

[3] *evaṃ ce taṃ labhetha*—*i.e.*, to procure what is allowable. This comprises the four medicines (oil, ghee, etc.) mentioned above. Note that the fifth medicine, butter, is absent here.

should be told: 'Sir, remove this.'[1] If he removes it, it is well. But if he does not remove it, a monk endowed with five qualities[2] should be agreed upon as silver-remover[3]: one who would not follow a wrong course through desire, one who would not follow a wrong course through hatred, one who would not follow a wrong course through stupidity, one who would not follow a wrong course through fear,[4] and one who would know what is removed and what is not removed. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as silver-remover, and it is right . . . Thus do I understand this.' It is to be removed by the monk agreed upon making no sign.[5] If, making a sign, he lets it drop, there is an offence of wrong-doing. [238]

---

[1] *imaṃ chaḍḍehi.* If he cannot go and exchange the *rūpiya* for something allowable, the *rūpiya* should be removed, since it is not allowable.

[2] *pañcah' aṅgehi samannāgato.* Here the qualities are as follows in the text. Another group of qualities are detailed at *A.* i. 162= *S.* i. 99; these are the constituents of morality, of concentration, of wisdom, of freedom, of freedom by knowledge and insight that are possessed by the adept (*asekha*)—*i.e.*, the arahan. *Cf.* below, p. 122.

[3] *rūpiya-chaḍḍaka.* I think that to translate this term as "bullion-remover," as at *Vin. Texts* i. 26, n. 4, gives a false notion of the extent of any *largesse* that a monk might have received. *Cf. Thag.* 620 *pupphacchaḍḍaka,* a scavenger of flowers, and *Vin.* iv. 6, where this is given as one of the low types of work.

[4] These are the four *agatis,* see *B.D.* i. 323, n. 7.

[5] The silver-remover must avoid drawing attention to the place where he throws down the *rūpiya.*

If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, taking[1] it or causing (another, to take it within a monastery or within a house,[2] he lays it aside, thinking, 'It will be for him who will take it'[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

---

[1] *uggahetvā*.

[2] *ajjha-āvasatha*. At *Vin*. iv. 69 ff. *āvasatha* is a "public rest-house." But *cf*. *ajjhâvasati*, to inhabit, to dwell in a house, above, p. 47, n. 5.

[3] *yassa bhavissati so harissati*. Probably a monk, whether accepting *rūpiya* from a lay-person visiting a monastery, or from a lay person whose house he is visiting, should lay it aside at once, so that either the owner may take it again, or someone else may pick it up. *Cf*. *Vin*. iv. 162 ff. in reference to a jewel—not given to a monk but picked up by a monk. At all events, in laying it aside, the monk's responsibility ceases, and he cannot be accused of committing an offence. To be allowed to accept *rūpiya* at all must be attributed to the courtesy that the monks must display towards the laity: by accepting gifts they confer a boon upon the donors. In view of the *anāpatti* (no offence) clause, the *sikkhāpada* (rule) clause even more strongly suggests not that a monk must not take or cause *rūpiya* to be taken at all, but that he must not take it or cause it to be taken for him with a view to keeping and using it or putting it by in deposit.

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks engaged in[1] various transactions in which gold and silver was used.[2] People . . . spread it about saying:

" How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses ?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can this group of six monks engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, engaged in various transactions in which gold and silver is used ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used ? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] *samāpajjati*, or " came into," see *B.D.* i. 201, n. 3.

[2] *rūpiya-saṁvohāra*, which *VA*. 696 explains as *jātarūparajataparivattana*, (involving) the exchange of gold and silver. On *rūpiya*, *jātarūpa* and *rajata*, see above, p. 100, n. 2.

Various means: shaped[1] and unshaped and (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped. *Shaped* means: intended (as an ornament) for the head, intended (as an ornament) for the neck, intended (as an ornament) for the hand, intended (as an ornament) for the foot, intended (as an ornament) for the hips. *Unshaped* means: it is called shaped in a mass.[2] *(Partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped* means: both of these. [239]

Gold and silver[3] means: what is the colour of the teacher,[4] the *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, the *māsaka* of wood, the *māsaka* of lac, used in business.[5]

Should engage in means: if he gets shaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets shaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets unshaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets shaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped . . . If he gets unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped . . . If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. It is to be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs,

---

[1] *kata.* This means made up into some definite object, an ear-ring or another ornament, for instance, as opposed to *akata*, unshaped—*i.e.*, still a *ghana*, a (shapeless) mass.

[2] *ghanakata.*

[3] *rūpiya.*

[4] *satthuvaṇṇa*, see above, p. 100, n. 2.

[5] This definition of *rūpiya* covers those of *jātarūpa* and *rajata* at *Vin.* iii. 238, thus giving the impression that *rūpiya* is a generic term for *jātarūpa* and *rajata.* See above, p. 100, n. 2.

engaged in various transactions in which gold and silver are used; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there . . . (*see* Nissag. XVIII. 2; *instead of*: except by the one who accepted gold and silver . . . and accepts gold and silver *read*: except by the one who got gold and silver in exchange . . . and gets gold and silver in exchange) . . . If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[1] || **2** ||

[1] This is the only *anāpatti* paragraph in the thirty Nissaggiyas where nothing more than these two invariable exemptions are given.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at the time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, came to be skilled[1] in robe-making. He, making an outer cloak of cloth rags,[2] making it well-dyed, well-worked, clothed himself in it. Then a certain wandering student,[3] having clothed himself in a costly cloth,[4] approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he said: [**240**]

" Your reverence, this outer cloak of yours is beautiful, give it to me for (this) cloth."

" Find out about it,[5] your reverence," he said.

" Yes, your reverence, I know (about it)."

" Very well, then, your reverence," he said and gave (it to him).

Then that wandering student, clothing himself in that outer cloak, went to the wandering students' monastery.[6] The wandering students spoke thus to

---

[1] *paṭṭho*, to be read throughout as *paddha*, also said of Upananda at *Vin.* iii. 210, of Udāyin at *Vin.* iv. 60. See *VA.* 665.

[2] *paṭa-pilotikā*, *cf. S.* ii. 219.

[3] *paribbājaka*, a wanderer, wandering student, wandering teacher. See Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 141 ff.; B. M. Barua, *Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 192, and *D.P.P.N.*

[4] *paṭa*, or cloak or garment.

[5] *jānāhi*. I think that the point of this injunction must be that when the wandering student wished to exchange the garments again (see just below), Upananda refused to do so because he was not going to be " taken in," and get back the outer cloak which he had managed to barter with the student. For, according to Bu. (*VA.* 699), his outer cloak was *dubbala* (worn).

[6] Special places were given for the accommodation of the wanderers, where they could meet with one another and enter into discussions during their travels. Also, like the Sakyaputtiyas, they did not go on tour during the three months of the rains.

this wandering student: " This outer cloak of yours is beautiful, your reverence. Where did you get it ?"

" It was in exchange for my cloth, your reverences."

" But, your reverence, this outer cloak will do[1] for you for some time (only). That cloth was better for you."

Then that wandering student, thinking: " What the wandering students said is true. This outer cloak will do for me for some time (only). That cloth was better for me," approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: " Your reverence, here is your outer cloak, give the cloth to me."

" But, your reverence, did I not say to you, ' Find out about it ' ? I will not give it," he said.

Then that wandering student . . . spread it about, saying: " Even householders give back to a householder if he regrets[2]; but why will one who has gone forth not give back to one who has gone forth ?"

Monks heard that wandering student who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, engage in bartering[3] together with a wandering student ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, engaged in bartering together with a wandering student ?"

" It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

" How can you, foolish man, engage in bartering together with a wandering student ? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . .

---

[1] *bhavissati.*

[2] *vippaṭisāri.* Here it means if he regrets what he has bartered and wants it back again.

[3] *kayavikkaya,* or " buying and selling." *Cetāpeti,* to get in exchange, and *parivatteti,* to exchange or barter (*cf.* above, pp. 60, 67, where the one is defined by the other), also imply a bartering. Here there was no buying and selling, only an exchange of articles.

And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should engage in various kinds of bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[1] || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Various means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.[2]

Should engage in . . . bartering means: if he transgresses,[3] saying: 'Give this for that, take this for that, barter this for that, get this in exchange for that,'[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. Inasmuch as it is bartered—one's own goods gone to the hands of another, another's goods gone to one's own hands—it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . [241] to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'I, honoured sirs, engaged in various kinds of bartering; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back (these goods) to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.[5] If he is in doubt as to whether it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bartering when it is not bartering, there

[1] At *D.* i. 5 it is said that an ordinary man might say of Gotama, in speaking praise of him, that he refrains from *kayavikkaya*, bartering.

[2] =below, p. 161=*Vin.* iv. 154 in definition of *lābho*. The last three items occur again below, p. 149.

[3] *ajjhācarati*; *cf. B.D.* i. 202, n. 3.

[4] *Cf.* below, p. 135.

[5] There must, I think, be a clause omitted: 'and engages in bartering.' Otherwise there is no sense in the offence.

is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not bartering, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is not bartering, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he asks the value, points it out to one who makes it legally allowable,[1] saying: 'This is ours, and we want this and that'; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || **2** ||

The Second Division: that on Silk

This is its key:

Two portions on silk and pure, for six years, a rug,
And two on (sheep's) wool, on taking, both the various kinds.[2]

---

[1] A *kappiyakāraka* makes a thing allowable by giving it. *VA.* 701, "saying, 'my utensils are valuable, give your bowl to another.'"

[2] *I.e.*, *rūpiyasaṃvohāra* (Nissag. XIX), and *kayavikkaya* (Nissag. XX). In the former there was not bartering, but payment in some kind of medium of exchange; in the latter there was exchange and barter, giving and taking.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made a hoard of many bowls.[1] People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place[2] and seeing (this hoard), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, make a hoard of many bowls? Will these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, do a trade in bowls or will they set up an earthenware shop?[3]" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks keep an extra bowl?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, keep an extra bowl?"

"It is true, lord." The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, keep an extra bowl? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . [242] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should keep an extra bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 243.

[2] *vihāra.* The laity visited the special *vihāras* which they themselves supported. This form of interest in the Order's well-being must have given an added reason for visiting *vihāras*, like our own way of visiting some charitable or other institution in which we are interested.

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 50.

Now at that time[1] an extra bowl had accrued to[2] the venerable Ānanda, and the venerable Ānanda became desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta; but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: " A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra bowl should not be kept. And this extra bowl has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me ?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

" But, how long, Ānanda, before Sāriputta will come (here) ?"

" On the ninth or tenth day, lord," he said.

Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

" I allow you, monks, to keep an extra bowl for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

An extra bowl may be kept for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[3] || 2 ||

For at most ten days means: it may be kept for ten days at the maximum.[4]

An extra bowl means: one that is not allotted, not assigned.[5]

---

1 *Cf.* Nissag. I, where the same story is told in the same words about keeping an extra robe. See above, p. 4.

2 *uppanno hoti.*

3 At *Vin.* iv. 243 the rule is that a hoard of bowls should not be made. There the group of six nuns, as here the group of six monks, are recorded to have made a hoard. There seems some discrepancy between a hoard and an extra bowl. The rule in this Nissag. XXI may have been altered from " a hoard " to " an extra bowl " to balance that against wearing an extra robe, Nissag. I.

4 *Cf.* above, p. 6.

5 =definition of " extra robe " at p. 7 above, and of *sannicayaṃ kareyya* at *Vin.* iv. 244.

A bowl[1] means: there are two kinds of bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl.[2] There are three sizes[3] for a bowl: a large bowl, a medium-sized bowl, a small[4] bowl. A large bowl means that it takes half an *āḷhaka* measure[5] of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry.[6] A medium-sized bowl means that it takes a *nāḷika* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. A small bowl means that it takes a *pattha* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. (A bowl) greater than that[7] is not a bowl, (a bowl) smaller (than that) is not a bowl.[7]

For him who exceeds (that period), there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with

---

[1] This definition of *patta*=*Vin.* iv. 123, 243.

[2] At *Vin.* ii. 112 these two kinds of bowls are " allowed " (*anujānāmi*). Whoever uses a wooden bowl, a golden or a silver one or one of eight other kinds mentioned there, commits a *dukkaṭa* offence.

[3] *vaṇṇâ ti pamāṇāni*, *VA.* 702.

[4] *omaka*, inferior, insignificant. Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 19, calls these " high, middle and low bowls."

[5] For these measures, *āḷhaka*, *nāḷika* and *pattha*, see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, pp. 18-20, and *B.D.* i. 12, n. 2; 103, n. 1.

[6] *tadupiya vyañjana.* On *tadupiya* see Trenckner, *J.P.T.S.* 1908, p. 131 ff., *Comy.* on *Miln.* 9. He says it is " perhaps properly a Vinaya word." But it occurs, as he mentions, at *S.* iii. 146, *tadupiyañca sūpeyyaṃ*, translated *K.S.* iii. 124 " broth for seasoning thereto." At *M.* ii. 54 we get the same phrase, translated *Fur. Dial.* ii. 28 " with curry-stuffs to match." *MA.* iii. 287 explains it as *tadanurūpa-telaphāṇitadīni*, while *VA.* 703 says: *tassa odanassa anurūpaṃ maccha-maṃsa-saka-phala-kaḷīrâdi byañjanaṃ*, curry of fish, meat, vegetables, fruits, bamboo-tips suitable to this boiled rice. At *Jā.* ii. 160 there is the expression *na ca paññā tadupikā*, which is explained to mean, ' But your wisdom does not match (*tadupikā*), does not correspond to (*anucchavikā*) your body ' (which was large).

[7] *tato ukkaṭṭho apatto, omako apatto.* On *apattaka*, see below, p. 123.

joined palms, should speak thus: 'Honoured sirs, [243] this bowl is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the bowl forfeited should be given (back with the words): 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This bowl of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should give back this bowl to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching two or three monks . . . (See Nissag. I. **3-4**) . . . '. . . I will give back this bowl to the venerable one.' . . .

. . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is broken[1] when it is not broken, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the bowl which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within ten days it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, broken, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || **3** ||

Then the group of six monks did not give back a bowl that had been forfeited. They told this matter

---

[1] In Nissag. I, II, III, XXVIII we get "burnt," of a robe.

[2] *Cf.* Nissag. I, II, III, XXVIII ("burnt"), and *Vin.* iv. 245 ("broken").

to the lord. He said: "Monks, a bowl that has been forfeited is not not to be given back. Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing."[1] || **4** ||

[1] See Nissag. I, where a similar story is told of a robe that had been forfeited; and *Vin.* iv. 245, again a bowl.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXII

. . . among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.[1] Now at that time monks were invited by a certain potter who said: "If these masters need a bowl, I (can supply them) with a bowl."[2] Now at that time monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls. They asked for large bowls for those who had small bowls, they asked for small bowls for those who had large bowls. Then that potter, making many bowls for the monks, could not make other goods for sale,[3] and he could not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? This (man), making many bowls for these (monks), [**244**] is not able to make other goods for sale, and he cannot keep himself going and his wife and children suffer."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, is it true, as is said, that monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ."

---

[1] See above, p. 94.

[2] *yesaṃ ayyānaṃ pattena attho ahaṃ pattenā ti.* For rest of this par. *cf. Pāc.* 86.

[3] *vikkāyikaṃ*, or "for giving away"—*i.e.*, in exchange or barter; see above, p. 110. *Cf. Jā.* i. 201.

And having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, a bowl is not to be asked for. Whoever should ask (for one), there is an offence of wrong-doing."[1] || 1 ||

Now at that time a certain monk's bowl became broken.[2] Then it occurred to that monk: "Asking for a bowl is forbidden by the lord," and being scrupulous, he did not ask (for one); he went about for alms-food (to be put) into his hands.[3] People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, go about for alms-food (to be put) into their hands, like followers of other sects?"[4] Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow you, monks, when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken, to ask for a bowl." || 2 ||

Now at that time the group of six monks said: "It is allowed by the lord to ask for a bowl when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken"; and these, because (their bowls) were a little broken and a little

---

[1] Note that Gotama is not here laying down a nissaggiya pācittiya but a dukkaṭa rule. Because of it a monk, following the injunction scrupulously, arouses the criticism of the laity, and an "allowance," an *anujānāmi*, is given (in || 2 ||). Then the group of six monks transgress the allowance; this leads to the formulation of the nissaggiya pācittiya (in || 3 ||).

[2] Examples of ways in which bowls got broken given at *Vin.* ii. 113 f.

[3] *hatthesu piṇḍāya carati.* See *Vin.* i. 90, where this expression occurs again, and again people complain that those ordained as monks are like *titthiyas.* *Cf.* also *Vin.* ii. 114, *tumbakaṭāhe piṇḍāya caranti,* they went for alms-food (to be put) into a gourd; and *Vin.* ii. 115, *ghaṭikaṭāhe,* into a water-pot (or skull).

[4] This wish to differentiate between *Sakyaputtiyas* and *titthiyas* shows the interest taken by lay people in the former, according to the texts, and a certain desire that their behaviour should be suit-

chipped[1] and a little scratched,[2] asked for many bowls. Then that potter, making many bowls, as before,[3] for the monks, was not able to make other goods for sale, and he did not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. As before,[3] people . . . spread it about, saying: " How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls ? This (man) making many bowls for these (monks), is not able to make other goods for sale, and he does not keep himself going and his wife and children suffer." Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can this group of six monks, when their bowls are a little broken and [**245**] a little chipped and a little scratched, ask for many bowls ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, when your bowls were a little broken . . . asked for many bowls ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, when your bowls are a little broken . . . ask for many bowls? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not yet pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should get another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended[4] in less than five places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. That bowl is to be forfeited by that monk to the company of monks, and whatever is the last bowl[5] belonging

---

able. Monks were not to ape householders on the one hand—*e.g.*, above, pp. 74, 106; now and at *Vin.* i. 90, ii. 114, 115, they are not to look like *titthiyas*.

[1] *appamattakena khaṇḍena.* [2] *vilikhitamattena.*

[3] *tath' eva,* " in that very way," thus " as before."

[4] *bandhanena,* from *bandhati,* to tie together, to unite; and not from *bhindati,* to break, as appears to have been thought at *Vin. Texts* i. 27. *C.P.D.* says, " without bands, esp. not riveted (said of alms-bowls)."

[5] *pattapariyanta. VA.* 708 says, " the bowl that remains at the end (*pariyante*) after this handing over."

to that company of monks, that should be given to this monk with the words: 'Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.'[1] That is the proper course in this case." || 3 || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

A bowl mended in less than five places means: it is not mended, or it is mended in one (place), or it is mended in two (places), or it is mended in three (places), or it is mended in four (places). A bowl with no room for mends means: its rim is not two finger-lengths[2] (in breadth). A bowl with room for mends means: its rim is two finger-lengths (in breadth).

New bowl means: it is so called with reference to the asking for (it).[3]

Should get in exchange means: he asks for (it). There is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. All should come together taking each the bowl in his keeping.[4] An inferior bowl should not be in his keeping if he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl.' If an inferior bowl is in his keeping, and he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl,' there is an

---

[1] *bhedanāya*, √*bhid*. *Cf.* phrase *kāyassa bhedā*, on the breaking up of the body.

[2] *dvaṅgulā*, as at *Vin.* ii. 294, *Thig.* 60. *VA.* 708, commenting upon *dvaṅgulā rājī na hoti*, says that there is not a rim measuring two finger-lengths below the upper circumference. *Cf. VbhA.* 343, *sattadhaññamāsappamāṇaṃ ekaṃ aṅgulaṃ.*

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 77, for definition of "new *santhata.*"

[4] *adhiṭṭhita-patta.* *Adhiṭṭhita*, from *adhitiṭṭhati* (or *adhiṭṭhahati* or *adhiṭṭheti*). This variety of spelling is paralleled by variety of meaning. *C.P.D.*, referring to the above passage, says that *adhiṭṭhitapatta* is "the obligatory alms-bowl." *Adhiṭṭhita*, besides meaning "allotted," as hitherto rendered, also means "taken in use, taken in possession." "Allotted bowl" would not be right here, since the "assigner of bowls" is yet to be agreed upon or appointed, which occurs just below. And he is appointed precisely to remedy any tendency of monks to carry an inferior bowl to the meeting of the Order, as though it were his usual one, hoping to get a costly one in its place.

offence of wrong-doing. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited. That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should say: 'Honoured sirs, this bowl, got in exchange by me for a bowl mended in less than five places, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. A monk endowed with five qualities should be agreed upon as assigner of bowls[1]: one who would not follow a wrong course through desire, one who would not follow a wrong course through hatred, one who would not follow a wrong course through stupidity, one who would not follow a wrong course through fear,[2] and one who would know what is taken and what is not taken. [**246**] And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as assigner of

[1] *pattagāhāpaka*, agent noun from causative *gāhāpeti*=to make to take, but here "to invite to take," to say: "be so good as to receive," "to make the bowl pass from one monk to another." *Cf. Vin.* ii. 177, where it is said that there was no *pattagā°* at that time; and *A.* iii. 275, where many of the officials of the Order are mentioned, and are recommended not to be appointed if they follow the four *agatis*, and cannot make a proper discrimination in their province.

[2] On the *agatis* see *B.D.* i. 323, n. 7, and *cf.* above, p. 104. Also *cf. Vin.* i. 283 for "receiver of robes" and *Vin.* ii. 167 for "assigner of lodgings," and above, p. 104, for "silver-remover."

bowls, and it is right. . . . So do I understand.' The monk agreed upon should make the bowl pass. He should say to an elder[1]: 'Honoured sir, let the elder take the bowl.'[2] If the elder takes it, the elder's bowl should be passed to a second.[3] He should not take it out of regard[4] for him.[5] For whoever should not take it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. It should not be made to pass to one who has what is not a bowl.[6] In this way the bowl should be made to pass down to the youngest member of the Order.[7]

Whatever is the last bowl belonging to that company of monks, that should be given to this monk[8] with the words[9]: 'Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.' This bowl should not be laid aside by that monk in what is not the right place[10]; it should not be used for improper purposes[11]; it should not be given

---

[1] *VA.* 708, "pointing out what is commendable in the bowl, he should say, 'This bowl is of the right measure, it is nice and it is suitable for an elder. Take it.'"

[2] *I.e.*, the new bowl just put at the disposal of the Order.

[3] To a second elder, according to age.

[4] *anuddayatāya*, explained as *anukampāya* (pity, compassion) at *VA.* 708. But for whoever is contented and says, 'What good is another bowl to me?' and does not take it, there is no offence.

[5] *I.e.*, the elder.

[6] *apattaka*. See Nissag. XXI. 3, above, p. 115, on *apatta*. At *Vin.* i. 90 it is said that one who is *apattako* is not to be ordained. *Apattaka* means either one who uses what is not a bowl—*e.g.*, gourds and water-pots—or one who has not a bowl—*e.g.*, a *titthiya* who uses his hands to receive alms-food (*Vin.* ii. 114, 115). *Cf.* *acīvaraka* at *Vin.* i. 90, which seems to mean one who has not a robe and who therefore went naked. At *Vin.* i. 93 monks are to be asked at the ordination ceremony whether they are complete as to bowl and robes.

[7] Everyone receives another bowl, so that the former bowl of the youngest member of the community remains free.

[8] *I.e.*, the one who had to forfeit his bowl.

[9] Doubtless spoken by the "assigner of bowls."

[10] *adese*, on a bed or couch or peg to hang a sunshade on. It is to be laid aside on a stand or stool, *VA.* 709. Dukkaṭa offences for putting bowls away in various wrong ways and places are given at *Vin.* ii. 113 f.

[11] *I.e.*, for cooking, colouring or boiling rice-gruel.

away[1] with the words: 'How can this bowl be lost or destroyed or broken?' If it is laid aside in the wrong place or used for improper purposes or given away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

This is the proper course in this case means: this is the appropriate course in this case. || 1 ||

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl . . . a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in one place, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl . . . a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that has room for one mend in exchange for an unmended bowl . . . If he gets a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that is mended in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. [247]

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. . . . If he gets a bowl mended in four places in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends . . . If he gets

[1] *na vissajjetabbo ti aññassa na dātabbo, VA.* 709.

a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

There is no offence if the bowl is destroyed, if the bowl is broken, if they belong to relations, if they are invited, if it is for another, if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[1] || 2 || 2 ||

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 49, 52, 57.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.[1] Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha,[2] desiring to make a cave,[3] had a (mountain) slope cleared near Rājagaha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

" What, honoured sir, is the elder having made ?"

" Sire, desiring to make a cave, I am having a (mountain) slope cleared," he said.

" Honoured sir, does the master require an attendant for the monastery ?"

" Sire, an attendant for a monastery is not prescribed by the lord."

" Well, honoured sir, asking the lord, you must tell him of me."

" Very well, Sire," the venerable Pilindavaccha answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha taught, roused and gladdened King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with dhamma-talk. And when King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had been taught, roused and gladdened with dhamma-talk by the venerable Pilindavaccha, rising up from his seat, greeting the venerable Pilindavaccha, he departed, keeping his right side towards him.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha sent a messenger to the lord, to say: " Lord, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha desires to present an attendant for a monas-

---

[1] =*Vin.* i. 206-9. [2] *Cf. B.D.* i. 112. [3] *leṇa.*

tery. Now, lord, what line of conduct is to be followed ?"

Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I allow an attendant for a monastery."

Then a second time did King [248] Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approach the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

"Honoured sir, has the lord prescribed an attendant for a monastery ?"

"Yes, Sire," he said.

"Well, honoured sir, I will give the master an attendant for the monastery."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, promising the venerable Pilindavaccha an attendant for the monastery, forgetting (but) remembering after a time, addressed a chief minister who was concerned with all the affairs,[1] saying: "My good man,[2] has that attendant for the monastery whom I promised, been given to the master ?"

"Your Majesty,[3] an attendant for the monastery has not been given to the master."

"My good man, how long is it since it was considered ?"

Then that chief minister, counting up the days, spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "It is five hundred days,[4] your Majesty."

"Well then, give five hundred attendants for the monastery to the master."

"Very well, your Majesty," and the chief minister, replying thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, made over to the venerable Pilindavaccha five hundred attendants for the monastery, and a distinct village

---

[1] *sabbatthaka mahāmatta.* [2] *bhaṇe.* [3] *deva.*
[4] "five hundred," of course, only means "many, several."

established itself. They even called it "The Village of the Monastery Attendants,"[1] and they called it Pilinda Village.[2] || 1 ||

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha came to be dependent (for alms) on the families in this village. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Pilinda Village for alms-food. Now at that time there came to be a festival in this village; young girls[3] wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, were celebrating it. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, as he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, came up to the dwelling of a certain attendant of the monastery, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Now at that time, the daughter of the monastery attendant's wife, seeing other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, cried and said: "Give me a garland, give me an ornament."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha said to that monastery attendant's wife: "Why is this little girl crying?"

"Honoured sir, this little girl is crying because, having seen other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, she says: 'Give me a garland, give me an ornament.' Whence is there a garland for us who are poor, whence is there an ornament?"

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, taking a roll of grass,[4] said to that monastery attendant's wife: "Now

---

[1] Ārāmikagāmaka.

[2] Pilindagāmaka.

[3] *dārikā*, with *v.l.* *dārakā*. Oldenberg at *Vin.* iii. 278, referring to this passage and to the one immediately following, says, 'I think we ought to read *dārakā, dārake.*' See also his notes at *Vin.* iii. 382. I think, however, that it is not necessary to take the reading *dārakā*. The point probably is that the daughter of the monastery attendant's wife was jealous of "other little girls," rather than of the children in general.

[4] *tiṇaṇḍupakan ti tiṇacumbaṭakaṃ*, *VA.* 709. This is the circular roll or coil of grass (or cloth) which Indians put on the head when they are carrying baskets, water-vessels, etc., on the head. One type of wife, *Vin.* iii. 139, is called *obhatacumbaṭa*, one from whom

set[1] this roll of grass on this little girl's head." Then that monastery attendant's wife, taking that roll of grass, set it on the little girl's head; it became a golden chaplet,[2] beautiful, [249] good to look upon, charming; there was no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of the king. People said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

"Your Majesty, in the house of a certain monastery attendant there is a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of your Majesty. As he is poor, where (could he have got it) from? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had that monastery attendant's family imprisoned. A second time did the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, enter Pilinda Village for alms-food. As he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, he came up to that monastery attendant's dwelling, and having come up, he asked the neighbours: "Where has this monastery attendant's family gone?"

"Honoured sir, they have been imprisoned by the king on account of that golden chaplet," they said. || 2 ||

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha went up to the residence of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having gone up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Pilindavaccha said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "How is it,

the pad (for the burdens she carries on her head) is taken. At *Jā*. i. 208 we get the word *cumbaṭakalaha*, a quarrel about a head-pad.

[1] *paṭimuñca*. Bu. at *VA*. 709 says *paṭimuñcî ti ṭhapesi*.

[2] *suvaṇṇamālā*; *VA*. 709 says a chaplet of golden lotuses.

Sire, that the monastery attendant's family is imprisoned?"

"Honoured sir, in that monastery attendant's house there was a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in our women's quarters. Where (could he have got it) from, as he is poor? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha exercised volitional force,[1] and said: "The palace[2] of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha is golden," and it became made all of gold.[3] He said: "Now, Sire, from where have you got so much gold?"

Saying, "I understand, honoured sir, this is the master's majesty of psychic potency," he set free the monastery attendant's family. People, delighted, full of satisfaction because they heard that a state of further-men, a wonder of psychic potency had been shown by master Pilindavaccha to the king and his retinue, presented the five kinds of medicine to the venerable Pilindavaccha, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses. Now the venerable Pilindavaccha was customarily a receiver,[4] so when he received the five kinds of medicine he gave them away among his company. And his company came to live in abundance; whatever they received, filling pots and pitchers, they put them away, and filling water-strainers and bags, they hung them up[5] in the windows. These (pots, etc.) were leaking,[6] and the dwelling-places became beset and

---

[1] *adhimucci=adhiṭṭhāsi*, *VA.* 709. *C.P.D.*, under both *adhimuccati* and *adhitiṭṭhati* gives "to make a (magical) act of volition." Lit. hyper-released, hyper-persisted. *Cf. B.D.* i. 128, n. 3.

[2] *pāsāda*, see above, p. 16, n. 5. [3] Mentioned at *Kvu.* 608.

[4] *lābhin.* He usually got plenty of alms-food, etc., and so did not need the extra amount.

[5] *laggeti*, or perhaps "packed." *Cf. Vin.* ii. 152, where monks *thavikāyo laggenti*, hung up or packed up their bags at the foot of beds and chairs.

[6] *olīnavilīnāni tiṭṭhanti*, were sticking and melting, hence they let through their contents, and hence there came to be rats. The Colombo and Siamese edns. of *VA.* read *heṭṭhā ca ubhato-passesu ca gaḷitāni*, leaking through the bottom and the sides.

overrun[1] by rats. [250] People seeing (this) as they were engaged in touring the dwelling-places, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: " These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are storing up goods indoors,[2] like King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha." Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can monks strive after abundance such as this ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks strive after abundance such as this ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: " Monks, how can these foolish men strive after abundance such as this ? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:[3]

Those medicines which may be partaken of[4] by ill monks, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses: accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[5] || 3 || **1** ||

Those medicines which are partaken of by ill monks means: *ghee*[6] is called ghee from cows or ghee from she-

[1] *okiṇṇavikiṇṇā.*

[2] *antokoṭṭhāgārikā.* At *Jā.* iii. 364, *mahicchā ime samaṇā anto°.*

[3] At *Vin.* i. 209 instead of this paragraph read, " having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:"

[4] *paṭisāyaniyānî ti paṭisāyitabbāni paribhuñjitabbānî ti attho, VA.* 710.

[5] *Vin.* i. 209, " exceeding that (time) is a matter to be dealt with according to the rule." From beginning of Nissag. XXIII to here=*Vin.* i. 206-9. *Cf.* Pāc. 38 for rule against eating food that has been stored. The Gandharajātaka (*Jā.* iii. 363) was told in reference to this rule.

Beginning with the above rule, the order of the Nissaggiyas which follow is different in the Pali, Sanskrit and Chinese texts. See *Le Prātimoksasūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, ed. Finot, *J. As.* Nov.-Dec., 1913, p. 39 (=499).

[6] =*Vin.* iv. 88, to " sugar-cane," below.

goats or ghee from buffaloes; ghee from those whose meat is suitable. *Fresh butter* means: fresh butter from just these. *Oil* means: sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey,[1] oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow.[2] *Honey* means: honey of bees.[3] *Molasses* means: what is produced from sugar-cane.

Accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days means: they may be used for seven days at the maximum.

For him who exceeds that (period) there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eighth day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, seven days having elapsed, this medicine of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . May I give back this medicine to the venerable one ?'

If he thinks that seven days have elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that the seven days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is allotted[4] when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . [251] If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If

[1] *madhukatela*, or "of the honey-tree," *madhuka* being the tree Bassia latifolia. *Madhukapuppharasa*, not allowed at *Vin.* i. 246; translated at *Vin. Texts* ii. 133 "liquorice-juice."

[2] *vasā*. At *VA.* 714 five kinds of *vasā* are given: that from bears, fish, alligators, pigs, donkeys.

[3] *makkhikāmadhu*. The bee is called *madhumakkhikā*.

[4] This and the next five cases=*Vin.* iii. 197, 262, except that *avikappita*, assigned, does not occur above. For *adhiṭṭhita* see above, p. 7, n. 1.

he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Acquiring something that has been forfeited,[1] it must not be made use of for bodily enjoyment,[2] it must not be consumed, it may be done into[3] a lamp or black colour,[4] it may be made use of by another monk for bodily enjoyment, it must not be consumed (by him). If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within seven days it is allotted, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from them; if they take it on trust; if it is sacrificed, renounced, given up[5] to one who is not ordained; if one devoid of longing,[6] giving (and) acquiring, makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

---

[1] *nissaṭṭha*, *cf.* above, p. 8. [2] Such as anointing the limbs.

[3] *upanetabbaṃ*, from *upa* + $\sqrt{nī}$, to bring to.

[4] *kālavaṇṇe*. Exact significance unknown, but with *padīpa* (lamp) is another use for oil, since *VA*. 718 uses the verb *makkheti*.

[5] At *Vin*. iii. 96 and *M*. i. 37 *catto vanto mutto*+*pahīno*. *VA*. 719, "if the medicine is sacrificed, renounced, given up for the sake of one's mind, the mind is sacrificed, renounced, given up, then the man is called devoid of longing as to his mind; it means, thus being devoid of longing, giving to a *sāmaṇera* (novice)."

[6] *anapekkha*.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a cloth for the rains[1] came to be allowed to monks by the lord.[2] The group of six monks, saying: " A cloth for the rains is allowed by the lord," looked about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand, they put them on, (but going) naked because the cloths for the rains were old, they let their bodies get wet with the rain. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: " How can this group of six monks look about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains are old, (going) naked,[3] let their bodies get wet with the rain ?"

---

[1] *vassikasāṭikā*. These are cloth garments used instead of the robes, for these had been found to become wet and heavy during the rains, *Vin*. i. 253. At *Vin*. ii. 177 we get *sāṭiya-* (=*sāṭika-*) *gāhāpaka*, translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 223 " receiver of under-garments." But *gāhāpaka* is " assigner," see above, p. 122, n. 1. *Udakasāṭikā* occurs at *e.g. Vin*. i. 294, iv. 278-9, meaning bathing-cloths (for nuns). This was not a cloth that was put on on top of or under the robes, but was worn instead of them. In the same way the *vassikasāṭikā* were worn by monks to save the robes and the discomfort of wearing wet robes. At *Vin*. iv. 172 the group of six monks had their *vassikasāṭikā* made to an unsuitable measure. The right measure was therefore prescribed, and was to be in length six spans of the accepted length, in breadth two and a half spans. As editor of *Vin. Texts* ii. 225, n. (*q.v.*) observes: " this is just enough to go round the loins from the waist half down to the knee." At *Vin*. iv. 173 *vassikasāṭikā* are defined as " for the four months of the rains," while at *Vin*. i. 297 it is allowed to allot cloths for the rains during the four months of the rains, after that time to assign them.

[2] *Vin*. i. 294; the giving of *vassikasāṭikā* was one of the eight boons conferred upon Visākhā.

[3] *Cf*. above, p. 45, where monks complained of monks going naked.

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, looking about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, you let your bodies get wet with the rain?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, looking about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, let your bodies get wet with the rain? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If he thinks, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' robe-material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk. If he thinks, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, [252] it should be put on. If he thinks, 'More than a month of the hot weather remains,' and should look about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if he thinks, 'More than half a month of the hot weather remains,' and making it, should put it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || **1** ||

If he thinks, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' robe-material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk means: having approached those people who formerly gave robe-material as cloths for the rains, he may speak to them thus: 'It is the time for robe-material as cloths for the rains, it is the season for robe-material as cloths for the rains, and other people are giving robe-material as cloths for the rains.' He should not say, 'Give me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, bring me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, barter[1] robe-material for me as a cloth for the

[1] *parivattetha. Cf.* above, pp. 60, 67, 111.

rains, get in exchange robe-material for me as a cloth for the rains.'

If he thinks, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, it should be put on means: making it in the half month of the hot weather remaining, it should be put on.

If he thinks, 'More than a month of the hot weather remains' means: if he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains while over a month of the hot weather remains,[1] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he thinks, 'More than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it he puts it on while more than half a month of the hot weather remains, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe-material as a cloth for the rains was looked about for by me while more than a month of the hot weather remained; making it, it was put on[2] while more than half a month of the hot weather remained; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this cloth for the rains to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than a month of the hot weather remains, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it,

[1] *atirekamāse sese gimhāne.*

[2] *paridahita* here replaces a past participle of *nivāseti*, otherwise used in this story.

puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than half a month of the hot weather remains, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If (going) naked, although there is a cloth for the rains, he lets his body get wet with the rain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1] If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than a month of the hot weather remains, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than half a month of the hot weather remains, [253] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, thinking, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if, thinking, 'Less than a month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Less than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if the cloth for the rains that has been looked for is worn out during the rains[2]; if the cloth for the rains that has

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 45, n. 3.

[2] *vassaṃ ukkaḍḍhiyyati.* *VA.* 721 gives *khepetvā—khepeti* perhaps meaning "to cause to waste." *Ukkaḍḍhiyyati* is perhaps "worn out," *cf. karṣita,* from √*kṛṣ*, one of whose meanings is given as "worn out" in Monier-Williams' *Dictionary.* *Avakarṣati* (*ava-kṛṣ*) can also mean "to take off." *Kshāpayati* given by Monier-Williams as "to destroy, ruin, make an end of, finish."

been put on is worn out during the rains; washing them, they should be laid aside, they should be put on (again) at the right season. (There is no offence) if the robe-material is stolen,[1] if the robe-material is destroyed,[2] if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

[1] *acchinnacīvarassâ ti etaṃ vassikasāṭikaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ, VA.* 723. It might be stolen by thieves when the monks were bathing.

[2] *naṭṭhacīvara*, see above, pp. 47, 48.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,[1] said to the monk who shared his brother's cell: "Come, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not go, honoured sir," he said, "my robe is worn thin."[2]

"Come, your reverence, I will give you a robe," he said and he gave him a robe. Then that monk heard: "It is said that the lord will set out on a tour of the country." Then it occurred to that monk: "I will not set out on a tour of the country with the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that monk: "Come now, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not set out on a tour of the country with you, honoured sir, I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

"But that robe, your reverence, which I gave you, that will set out on a tour of the country with me," he said, and angry and displeased,[3] he tore it away.[4] Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, yourself

---

[1] See above, Nissag. VI, XVIII, XX. [2] *dubbala*.

[3] *kupito anattamano*, said of Devadatta at *Vin*. ii. 189.

[4] *VA*. 723, by force, *balakkārena aggahesi*.

having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tore it away?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How can you, foolish man, [254] yourself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, should tear it away or should cause it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."[1] || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

To a monk means: to another monk.

Himself means: himself[2] having given.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.[3]

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.[4]

Should tear it away means: if he tears it away himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should cause it to be torn away means: if he commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having commanded once, he then tears many away,[5] it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having myself given this robe to a monk, it was

---

[1] *Cf.* Pāc. 81.

[2] *sāmaṃ* explained by *sayaṃ*.

[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 7, 40, 48.

[4] *Cf. B.D.* i. 281; *Vin.* iv. 236; *M.* i. 101.

[5] *VA.* 723, "if he commands, 'take robe-material,' there is an offence of wrong-doing; if, having commanded, he says, 'take many,' there is an offence of expiation. If he says, 'take the outer cloak, the inner and the upper robes,' for each speech there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he says, 'take everything given by me,' for one speech made there are many offences."

torn away by me; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained, (then if) angry and displeased he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is not ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given another requisite, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having given a robe or another requisite to one who is not ordained, (then if) angry and displeased he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1]

There is no offence if he gives it or takes (from him) in a friendly manner[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 || [255]

[1] Here text is surely corrupt, for instead of *āpatti dukkaṭassa* it should read *anāpatti*. Oldenberg gives no variant reading.

[2] *vissasanto*, putting his trust in him. Text reads *vissāsanto*; Sinhalese edn. *vissasanto*, which is rather more correct, being from *viśvasiti*.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVI

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the group of six monks, at the time of robe-making, asked for much yarn,[1] so that when the robe-material was made much yarn came to be over. Then it occurred to the group of six monks: "Now then, your reverences, let us, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers." Then the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A second time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A third time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers. People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?"

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, yourselves asking for yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, yourselves asking for

[1] *sutta*, yarn or thread.

yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, himself asking for yarn, should have robe-material woven by weavers, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Himself means: himself asking.

Yarn means: the six (kinds of) yarn[1]: linen, cotton, silk, wool,[2] coarse hempen cloth,[3] canvas.[4]

By weavers[5] means: if he has it woven by weavers[6] there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is

---

[1] These are the six kinds of thread for making the six kinds of robe-materials that are allowable to monks. These latter are given in this order at *e.g. Vin.* i. 58=96, and especially see *Vin.* i. 281, where they are allowed. The six kinds of robe-materials or robes are referred to at *e.g. Vin.* iii. 210, 213.

[2] *VA.* 724, yarn of sheep's wool.

[3] The wearing of *sāṇa* was one of the practices adopted by wanderers belonging to other sects, *D.* i. 166, iii. 41, *A.* i. 240, *M.* i. 78, *Pugg.* 55. The *Comys.* explain *sāṇa* by using the word itself, as either *sāṇavākasutta* (*VA.* 724, yarn of the bark of *sāṇa*), *sāṇavākacelāni* (*DA.* 356=*AA.* ii. 354, garments of . . .), *sāṇavākamayaṃ* (*SA.* i. 159, made of . . .). *Sāṇa* was probably a plant, see next note below. At *S.* ii. 202 Kassapa insisted on wearing, and at *S.* ii. 222 accepted from the lord his own, *sāṇāni paṃsukūlāni*, coarse hempen rag-robes.

[4] *bhaṅga.* *VA.* 724, 1119 give two meanings: (1) thread made of bark, (2) thread mixed with these five other threads. See Joges Chandra Ray, *IHQ.* xv. 2, 1939, p. 197, "the inner bark of the plant yields a strong fibre, fit for strings and ropes, and a coarse cloth, canvas, is woven." In identifying Bhaṅgā with Soma, the relation of *bhaṅga* to *sāṇa* is also brought out, for, according to the lexicographers quoted by Chandra Ray, they also are identical; and the commentarial explanations, that *sāṇāni* are said to be of bark, are illuminated. I am indebted to this article for the suggestion that "canvas" is a possible translation of *bhaṅga.*

[5] *tantavāya.*

[6] *pesakāra. Cf. Vin.* iv. 7. Monier-Williams: "*peśaskārī, f.*, Ved. a woman who weaves artistically or embroiders."

to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to . . . an individual. [256] And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe caused by me to be woven by weavers, having myself asked for the yarn, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is no offence.

It is no offence to sew a robe[1] to a binding,[2] to a belt,[3] to a shoulder-strap,[4] to a bag for carrying the bowl in,[5] to a water-strainer[6]; if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property[7]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

[1] *VA.* 727 says that there is no offence in asking for thread (or yarn) to sew a robe.

[2] *Āyoga.* At *Vin.* ii. 135 the use of *āyoga* is allowed to monks. The word is translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 141 as "handicraft." But I think that because the monks ask how an *āyoga* should be made (omitted at *Vin. Texts* iii. 141), and are allowed the apparatus belonging to a loom, *āyoga* should be rendered "bandage" or "binding" in that passage. *Cf. Vv.* 33 (p. 30), where *āyogapaṭṭa* (preceded by *aṁsavaṭṭaka* and that by *kāyabandhana*) means "strip, bandage."

[3] *kāyabandhana.* At *Vin.* ii. 136 belts or waist-bands were allowed to monks.

[4] *aṁsabandhaka.* At *Vin.* i. 204, ii. 114 shoulder-straps are allowed to monks. [5] *pattatthavikā;* allowed at *Vin.* ii. 114.

[6] Allowed at *Vin.* ii. 118. These five articles are mentioned together again as not giving rise to an offence at *Vin.* iv. 170.

[7] *Cf.* above, pp. 27, 49, 52, 57, 125.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time a certain man, going off on a journey,[1] said to his wife:

"Weighing[2] yarn, give it to a certain weaver; getting him to weave robe-material, take care of it; when I come back I will present[3] master Upananda[4] with robe-material."

A certain monk, as he was going for alms, heard this man as he was speaking thus. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit,[5] for at a certain place a certain man, going off on a journey, said to his wife: 'Weighing yarn . . . I will present master Upananda with robe-material.'"

"Sir, he is my supporter," he said. For this very weaver was the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this weaver, and having approached he spoke thus to the weaver:

"Sir, this robe-material is being specially woven for me; make it long and wide and rough,[6] make it evenly

---

[1] *pavāsaṃ gacchanto.*

[2] *dhārayitvā ti tuletvā*, *VA.* 727. *Tuleti* is to weigh.

[3] *acchādeti*, see above, p. 53, n. 2.

[4] *Cf.* Nissag. VI, XVIII, XX, XXV.

[5] Same thing said to Upananda at *Vin.* i. 300 and iii. 215, 217 (pp. 53, 58, above).

[6] Here "soft," the opposite of "rough," is omitted. *Cf.* above, p. 56.

woven[1] and well woven[2] and well scraped[3] and well combed."[4]

"Honoured sir, having weighed this yarn, they gave it to me, saying, 'Weave robe-material with this yarn.' Honoured sir, I am not able to make it long or wide or rough, [257] but I am able, honoured sir, to make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed."

"You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage[5] of this yarn."

Then that weaver, as soon as the yarn had been brought,[6] setting it up on the loom, went up to that woman, and having gone up he said to that woman: "The master wants yarn."

"Were not you, master, told by me: 'Weave robe-material with that yarn'?"

"It is true that I, lady, was told by you: 'Weave robe-material with this yarn'; but master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to me: 'You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage of this yarn.'"

Then that woman gave a second time[7] just as much yarn as she had given at first. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, heard it said that "The man is come back from his journey." Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached

---

[1] *suvīta*. *VA*. 727, *sabbaṭṭhānesu samaṃ katvā*, making it level (or even) everywhere.

[2] *suppavāyita*. *VA*. 727, *sabbaṭṭhānesu samam katvā tante pasāritaṃ*, making it level everywhere, it is stretched on a loom. Really *suppavāyita* is a synonym for *suvīta*.

[3] *suvilekhita*. *VA*. 727 says *lekhaniyā suṭṭhu vilikhitaṃ*. Perhaps it means that the yarn is well scraped so as to remove any rough bits, but the meaning of *lekhanī* is doubtful.

[4] *suvitacchita*. *VA*. 727 says, *kocchena suṭṭhu vitacchitaṃ suviniddhotan ti attho*. *P.E.D.* gives "well-carded" for *suvitacchita*. *Koccha* is a comb.

[5] *paṭibaddhan ti vekallaṃ*. *VA*. 727-8, perhaps "a refusal, a holding back, an obstruction with regard to."

[6] *yathābhataṃ suttaṃ*. See meanings of *yathābhataṃ* in *P.E.D.*

[7] *pacchā*, afterwards.

that man's dwelling and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that man said to his wife: "Is that robe-material woven?"

"Yes, master, that robe-material is woven."

"Bring it, I will present master Upananda with robe-material." Then that woman bringing that robe-material and giving it to her husband, told him this matter. Then that man, giving that robe-material to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; it is not easy to present them with robe-material. How can master Upananda, before being invited by me, going up to a householder's weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?"[1]

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, going up to a householder's weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, going up to a householder's weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?"

"He is not a relation, lord."

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation. Thus will you, foolish man, before being invited, [258]

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 53.

going up to a householder's weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A man or a woman householder who is not a relation may cause robe-material to be woven by weavers for a monk. Then if that monk, before being invited, going up to the weavers, should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material, saying: 'Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give the venerable ones[1] something or other in addition.'[2] And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl,[3] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

For a monk[4] means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.

A householder means: he who lives in a house.

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.

By weavers means: by weavers.[5]

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-material including the least one fit for assignment.[6]

---

[1] *āyasmantānaṃ*. Polite, perhaps here cajoling, form of address. *Cf.* above, p. 54.

[2] *anupadajjeyyāma*.

[3] *piṇḍapātamattaṃ ; piṇḍapāta* is the alms-food, but enough was usually received for the daily meal to fill a begging-bowl. See *Old Comy.* below.

[4] For the remainder of this Nissag. *cf.* Nissag. VIII. 2.

[5] *tantavāyehî ti pesakārehi*, *cf.* above, p. 143.

[6] *Cf.* above, pp. 40, 48, 140.

May cause to be woven means: causes to be woven.

If that monk means: the particular monk for whom the robe-material is being woven.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): 'What kind of robe-material do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe-material shall I have woven for you?'

Going up to the weavers means: going to the house, approaching (them) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material means: *he says: 'Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give the venerable ones something or other in addition.' And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl* means: the contents of a begging-bowl are called conjey and rice[1] and [259] solid food and a lump of chunam[2] and a tooth-pick and unwoven thread, and he even speaks dhamma.[3]

If according to what he says, he makes it long or wide or rough, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe-material, approaching the weavers of a householder who is not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

---

[1] *bhatta*; *cf. Vin.* iv. 129. More usually *bhojaniya* is combined with the next, *khādaniya*.

[2] This and the next two occur together at *Vin.* iii. 241, 266; iv. 154.

[3] *VA.* 728, "he gives dhamma-talk"—*i.e.*, perhaps a blessing, good words—for as the text shows, a monk can give things of the mind (*dhamma-dāna*, the best of gifts, *A.* i. 91) besides material things.

If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is not a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt as to whether he is not a relation, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if desirous of having costly (robe-material) woven he has (robe-material) costing little woven; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain chief minister, going on a journey, sent a messenger to the monks, saying: "Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift)."[1] The monks, thinking: "A rains-residence (gift) at the end of the rains is allowed by the lord,"[2] being scrupulous, did not go.[3] The chief minister . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered ones not come[4] when a messenger was sent by me? Well, I am going with the army, life is uncertain, death is uncertain."[5]

Monks heard that chief minister who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, having accepted a special robe,[6] to lay it aside." || 1 ||

---

[1] *vassâvāsika*. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, i. 228, renders, "food of the season of the rains"; *ibid.* ii. 8, "lodging during the season of the rains," but neither of these can be meant here, since the rule is concerned with robes. It means rather something connected with the rains-(*vassa*-)residence (*āvāsa*), which may be food, clothing or lodgings, as the story demands. *Vassâvāsa* occurs at *Vin.* i. 153.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 153 ff.

[3] It seems that the minister must have been offering his gift *during* the rains—*i.e.*, at a time when the monks must travel as little as possible—and not at the end of the rains. Otherwise the scrupulous monks could have gone, and no complaints would have been raised.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 64, where Upananda did not wait when bidden by a layman to do so.

[5] *dujjanaṃ jīvitaṃ dujjanaṃ maraṇaṃ.*

[6] *acceka-cīvara*, expl. at *VA.* 729 as *accāyika-cīvara*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 166, *accāyike karaṇīye*, "if there is something urgent (special) to be done" See *Vin. Texts* i. 29, n. 3, where it is said "'special

Now at that time monks said: "It is allowed by the lord, accepting a special robe, to lay it aside." [260] These accepting special robes, let the robe-season[1] pass. These robes tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.[2] Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles, that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes; seeing them he said to the monks:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?"

"Your reverence, they are our special robes," they said.

"But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?"

Then these monks told the venerable Ānanda when they had been laid aside. The venerable Ānanda . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

robe' is no doubt an inadequate rendering; but we have chosen it in reference to the special circumstances in which the donation is made, and in default of a better translation." *C.P.D.* says of *accekacīvara* that it is "a robe presented to a priest [*sic*] not at the usual time," and of *accāyika* (Skrt. *ātyayika*) that it is "not suffering delay, urgent, pressing." An "exceptional" or "emergency" robe might be a suitable translation, if it is remembered that it is the donor who is in an emergency, who is pressed for time, and who because of some exceptional or unusual circumstances, wants to make his gift without delay, and so gain the "merit" for his act of giving. Here the chief minister wanted to make his gift before he went into the army and faced the uncertainties of life and death. See *Old Comy.* below and *VA.* 729 which correlate *accekacīvara* with *vassâvāsika*, as though a robe given to meet some emergency implies a robe given at an unusual time—*i.e.*, here during the rains. The robe therefore is "special," both in regard to the reason for giving it, and in regard to the time at which it was given.

[1] *cīvarakālasamaya*, see *Old Comy.* below. This robe-season is the usual time for accepting, distributing and settling robe-material. *Cf.* also Nissag. I and *Vin. Texts* i. 18, n. The word occurs again at *Vin.* iv. 286.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 25.

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass? Monks, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"If a special robe should accrue[1] to a monk ten days before the full moon of the (first) Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed),[2] it may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (as something) special[3]; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season. But if he should lay it aside for longer than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 || **1** ||

Ten days before means: ten days before the ceremony held at the end of the rains.[4]

The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed) means: the ceremony held at the end of the rains is called Kattika.

A special robe means: one is desirous of going with

---

[1] *uppajjeyya*, lit. should arise, should be produced for. See above, pp. 4, 24, 90, 99, 114.

[2] *kattikatemāsipuṇṇamā*. *Kattika* (Skrt. *kārttika*) is the month Oct.-Nov., when the full moon (*puṇṇamā*) is near the Pleiades. This month is the last of the five months of the rains. The full moon of Assayuja is called *kattikatemāsinī*; the full moon of Kattika (the last month of the rains) is called *kattikacātumāsinī*. Thus there were two full moons in Kattika. *Kattikatemāsipuṇṇamā* might be translated: "The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed"; or even "three months of the year having passed," if the year were reckoned to begin at the first month of the rains, Āsāḷha). *Cf.* Nissag. XXIX below, p. 157, for *kattikacātumāsinī*.

[3] *accekaṃ maññamānena*.

[4] *pavāraṇā*, held to inquire whether any fault can be laid to the charge of any monk or nun in respect of what has been seen, heard, or suspected. *Cf. Vin.* i. 160, ii. 32; *B.D.* i. 283, 292; and Horner, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, pp. 133 ff.

the army, or one comes to be going on a journey, or one comes to be ill, or a woman becomes pregnant, or faith comes to be arisen in one who was without faith, or pleasing comes to be arisen for one who was not pleased.[1] If such a one should send a messenger to the monks saying: 'Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift),' this means a special robe.

It may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (*as something*) *special; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season* means: making a sign,[2] it must be laid aside; this is a special robe.

The robe-season means: if the kaṭhina cloth has not been (formally) made then the last month of the rains; if it has been (formally) made, it is five months.[3] [261]

If he should lay it aside for longer than that means: if the kaṭhina cloth has not been (formally) made, and he lets the last day of the rains pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If the kaṭhina cloth has been (formally) made and he lets the day for removing the kaṭhina (privileges)[4] pass, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, letting pass the robe-season, this special robe of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this special robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is a special robe, and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a special robe and lets the robe season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is a

[1] *appasannassa vā pasādo uppanno hoti. Cf.* above, p. 3, n1., on the recurring expression: *n' etaṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya*, " it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased."

[2] *saññānaṃ katvā. VA.* 729, *kiñci nimittaṃ katvā*, " making some mark," presumably on the robe.

[3] =*Vin.* iv. 286 f. *Cf.* p. 5, n. 1, p. 26, n. 3 above on *atthata*, formally made. [4] *kaṭhinuddhāradivasa*, *cf.* above, p. 5, n. 3.

special robe and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not allotted,[1] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned . . . If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, within the season, it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it (from him), if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || 2 ||

---

[1] This and the next six cases = *Vin.* iii. 197, 251, see above.
[2] *Cf.* Nissag. I, II, III, XXI, XXIX.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who had finished keeping the rains were staying in lodgings in the jungles. Thieves (of the kind who attack monks in the month) of Kattika[1] attacked them, saying: " The monks have received possessions."[2] They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: " I allow you, monks, when staying in lodgings in the jungles, to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house."[3] || 1 ||

Now at that time monks thought: " It is allowed by the lord when staying in lodgings in the jungles [262] to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house." These, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, were away for more than six nights. These robes were lost and destroyed and burnt and eaten by rats. The monks became badly dressed, wearing shabby robes. (Other) monks spoke thus:

" How is it that you, your reverences, are badly dressed, wearing shabby robes ?" Then these monks told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can these monks, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks laying aside

---

[1] *kattikacorakā*. *VA*. 730, *kattikamāse corā*—*i.e.*, after the distribution of the robes. [2] *laddhalābhā*.

[3] So as to be guarded, *VA*. 730. *Cf*. Nissag. II above, and notes, where an ill monk may be away without his set of three robes for more than a night, if he has the agreement of the monks.

one of the three robes inside a house were away for more than six nights?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Having spent the rains up to the full moon of Kattika,[1] in case a monk who is staying in such lodgings as those jungle lodgings which are held to be dangerous and frightening, so desires, he may lay aside one of his three robes inside a house; and should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe, that monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights. Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that, except on the agreement of the monks,[2] there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." ||2||**1**||

Having spent the rains means: when they have finished (keeping) the rains.

The full moon of Kattika means: it is called the (night of) Kattika-cātumāsinī.[3]

Those jungle lodgings means: the last lodging called "jungle" is five hundred *dhanus* measures[4] (away from the village).[5]

---

[1] *Kattikapuṇṇamā*, see *Old Comy.* below. This is the next full moon to that meant in the last Nissaggiya—*i.e.*, it is the last full moon of Kattika (and of the rains); see *VA.* 658, 730 and above, p. 153, n. 2.

[2] Probably the same kind of agreement as in Nissag. II—*i.e.*, the agreement to be regarded as *not* away, separated from the robe, although in fact the monk was away from it.

[3] See above, p. 153, n. 2. *Vin. Texts* i. 324 says: "the epithet *cātumāsinī* refers to the Vedic Cāturmāsya festival, which falls upon that day" (*i.e.*, the full moon day in the month of Kattika). This day, or night, "is called Komudī (from *kumuda*, a white water-lily), because that flower is supposed to bloom then," *Dial.* i. 66, n.

[4] *dhanus* is a measure of length; according to Monier-Williams it is equivalent to four hastas, or $\frac{1}{2000}$ *gavyūti*.

[5] So *VA.* 731.

Dangerous[1] means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are resting[2] is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.

Frightening[3] means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.

In case a monk is staying in such lodgings means: a monk staying in lodgings like these. [**263**]

Desires means: wanting.

One of his three robes means: the outer cloak or the upper robe or the inner robe.[4]

May lay aside inside a house means: he may lay it aside in the neighbourhood in a food-village.[5]

And should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe means: should there be a reason, should there be (something) to be done.[6]

That monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights means: he may be away, separated (from it) for six nights at the maximum.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise on the seventh day. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having been away, separated from this robe of mine, for more than six nights, except on the agreement of the monks, it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than six

---

1 *Cf.* below, p. 290, and *MA.* ii. 109.
2 *ṭhitokāsa.*
3 *Cf.* below, p. 290, and *MA.* ii. 109.
4 See above, p. 1, n. 2.
5 *gocara-gāma*, *VA.* 731 says: "in the neighbourhood of his jungle lodging." *Cf. PvA.* 12, 42. It is a village where food is given to monks; *gocara* meaning pasturage or grazing.
6 *karaṇīya.*

nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than six nights, and is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than six nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is not taken away[1] . . . If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, (and) is away except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than six nights, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is away, separated for six nights; if he is away, separated for less than six nights; if, being away, separated for six nights, entering the village-boundary and staying (there) he departs again; if, within six nights, the (robe) is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || **2** || [**264**]

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 22, n. 3.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 23.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.[1] Now at that time at Sāvatthī robes and food were prepared for[2] the Order by a certain guild,[3] saying: "Having offered them food,[4] we will present them with robe-material." Then the group of six monks approached that guild, and having approached they said to that guild: "Sirs, give these robes to us."

"Honoured sirs, we will not give; alms-food with robes are got ready by us every year for the Order."

"Sirs, many are the Order's benefactors, many are the Order's devotees.[5] We are here, depending on you, looking to you, but if you will not give to us, then who is there[6] who will give to us? Sirs, give these robes to us."

Then that guild, being pressed by the group of six monks, giving the group of six monks as much robe-material as was prepared, served the Order with a meal. Those monks who knew that robe-material and a meal were prepared for the Order, and did not know that (it) was given to the group of six monks, spoke thus:

"Sirs, dedicate[7] robe-material to the Order."

---

[1] =Pāc. 82, *Vin.* iv. 155, except that there the offence is procuring something for another person, and not, as here, for oneself. *Cf.* Pāc. 81.

[2] *paṭiyattaṃ*. [3] *pūja*, or group. [4] *bhojetvā*.

[5] *bhattā*, with *v.l. kattā* (see *Vin.* iii. 279), and Sinhalese edn. *bhaddā*. *VA.* 732 reads *bhadrā*, taking it=*bhadrāni*=*lābhamukhāni* (with *v.ll. bhaddā*, *bhattā* . . . *bhattāni*). It therefore looks more as if a "devotee" were meant than a "meal," especially in conjunction with *dāyakā*, benefactors. [6] *ko carahi*.

[7] *oṇojethâ ti detha*, *VA.* 732; *cf. Vin.* i. 39, *A.* iv. 210, *Miln.* 236, where *oṇojeti* seems to imply a rite of cleansing by water (*udakaṃ oṇojetvā*) and also a ceremonial giving, implied by the presence of *bhiṅkāra*, a ceremonial vessel used in donations.

"Honoured sirs, there is none; the masters, the group of six monks, appropriated[1] to themselves as much robe-material as was prepared."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks knowingly[2] appropriate to themselves an apportioned[3] benefit belonging to the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly appropriated to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, knowingly appropriate to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should knowingly appropriate to himself an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." ||1||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

He knows[4] means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells (him). [265]

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to (it).[5]

A benefit means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.[6]

---

[1] *pariṇāmesuṃ*, causative of *pariṇamati*. [2] *jānaṃ*.

[3] *pariṇata*. This is derived from the same root as *pariṇāmeti*; its indicative is *pariṇamati*. *VA*. 733 says *ninna poṇa pabbhāra*, bending to, leading to, sloping to.

[4] *jānāti*, indicative, instead of the *jānaṃ*, participle, of the Rule.

[5] *Cf. Vin*. iv. 43. [6] *Cf*. above, pp. 111, 149, and *Vin*. iv. 154.

Apportioned means: it has been expressly said,[1] "we will give, we will make."

If he appropriates to himself, in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, knowingly appropriated by me to myself, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . '. . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this benefit to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order[2] or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for another shrine or for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he himself being asked, 'Where

[1] *vācā bhinnā hoti*; *cf. vācaṃ bhindeyya* at *Vin.* i. 157, "uttering a word," *Vin. Texts* i. 326.

[2] *VA.* 733, for the Order in one *vihāra*. *Saṅgha* means, not the whole Order, but five or more monks (see above, p. 7, n. 5) staying in various districts and *vihāras*.

do we give ?' says, 'Give wherever your gift would be used[1] or could be mended[2] or should be for a long time or when for you the mind is peaceful '[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

The third Division: that on Bowls

This is its key:

Two on bowls, and on medicine, for the rains, the fifth on a gift,
Oneself, causing to be woven, a special robe, dangerous, and for the Order.

Venerable ones, recited are the thirty rules for offences of expiation involving forfeiture. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter ? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter ? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter ? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent, thus do I understand this.

Told are the Offences of Expiation involving Forfeiture[4] [266]

---

[1] *paribhogaṃ labheyya*, lit. might receive use.

[2] *paṭisaṁkhāram labheyya.* [3] *tumhākaṃ cittaṃ pasīdati.*

[4] Here ends Oldenberg's *Vinayapiṭaka*, vol. iii.

SUTTAVIBHAṄGA (PĀCITTIYA)

Praise to the lord, the perfected one, the fully enlightened.

[These ninety-two rules, venerable ones, for offences of expiation come up for recitation.]

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) I

AT that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time Hatthaka,[1] the son of the Sakyans,[2] came to be overthrown in debate.[3] He, talking with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged, having acknowledged, denied, he shelved the question by (asking) another,[4] he told a conscious lie,[5] having made a rendezvous,[6] he deceived with words.[7] The followers of sects holding other views looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

---

[1] Probably not the Hatthaka of Āḷavī, see *A.* i. 26, 88, 136, also 278 (*devaputta*), iv. 218. But probably the same as the Hatthaka concerning whom *Dhp.* 264 (*na muṇḍakena samaṇo*) was uttered. For *DhA.* iii. 390, which, though longer, is very similar to *VA.* 736, says that whenever Hatthaka was defeated in argument he would make another appointment with his opponents, then precede them to the appointed place and say: 'The followers of other sects are so frightened of me that they dare not meet me; this is like a defeat on their part.' This fits in well with *Vin.* story told above.

[2] *VA.* 735, *Sakyānaṃ putto ti Sakyaputto.* [3] *vādakkhitto.*

[4] *āññen' aññam paṭicarati. VA.* 735 says, *aññena kāraṇena aññaṃ kāraṇaṃ paṭicarati paṭicchādeti ajjhottharati,* he answered one question by another, hid it, covered it up. *Cf. D.* i. 94, *A.* i. 187, 198, *M.* i. 250, *Vin.* iv. 35. "To meet one question with an answer of quite different contents" (*C.P.D.*), but at *Vin.* iv. 35 Channa meets questions by putting other questions.

[5] *sampajānamusā bhāsati.*

[6] *saṃketaṃ katvā. Cf. Vin.* iii. 53, 78.

[7] *visaṃvādeti.* Forestalling his opponents at the rendezvous, he said that they were defeated.

"How can this Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, talking together with us, having denied, acknowledge, having acknowledged, deny, shelve the question by (asking) another, tell a conscious lie, having made a rendezvous, deceive with words?"

Monks heard these followers of sects holding other views who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks approached Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, they spoke thus to Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, reverend Hatthaka, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged . . . deceived with words?"

"Your reverences, these followers of sects holding other views should be vanquished in some way; victory should not be given to them thus."

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can this Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledge, [1] having acknowledged, deny, shelve the question by (asking) another, tell a conscious lie, having made a rendezvous, deceive with words?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Hatthaka, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged . . . deceived with words?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledge . . . having made a rendezvous, deceive with words? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In telling a conscious lie,[1] there is an offence of expiation."[2] || 1 ||

Telling a conscious lie means: the words, the utterance, the speech, the talk, the language, the intimation, the un-ariyan statements[3] of one intent upon deceiving with words, saying: "I have seen what I have not seen, heard what I have not heard, sensed[4] what I have not sensed, cognised what I have not cognised.[5] I have not seen what I have seen, not heard what I have

[1] *sampajānamusāvāde*. *Cf*. *Vin*. iii. 59, 66, 93 f., where this rule has been anticipated; and see *B.D*. i. xxv. 162 ff. for offences involving defeat for telling a conscious lie. Here Kankhā-vitaraṇī, *S.H.B*., p. 83, says that all conscious lying is a *pācittiya*. It, however (p. 82), draws attention to the fact that the conscious lie of claiming a state of further-men is a *pārājika* (IV); that falsely to accuse someone of a *pārājika* is a *saṅghâdisesa* (VIII); that unfoundedly to accuse someone of a *saṅghâdisesa* is a *pācittiya* (76); that falsely to accuse someone of a failure in morality is a *dukkaṭa* (Pāc. 76, *Vin*. iv. 148). [2] *pācittiya*. See above, p. 3, n. 4.

[3] *anariya-vohārā*. The above eight are enumerated at *Vin*. v. 125, *D*. iii. 232, *A*. ii. 246, *Vbh*. 376.

[4] *amutaṃ mutaṃ me*. *Mutaṃ* translated at *Dial*. iii. 127 "felt," *Dial*. iii. 223 "thought of," *Fur*. *Dial*. i. 3 and *G.S*. ii. 251 "sensed," *S.B.E*. x., 2nd edn., 198 "thought." Geiger, *Pali Literatur*, gives "gedacht." The *Old Comy.'s* definition of *muta* shows that the sense-functions of nose, tongue and body had been differentiated by the time that it was compiled. Hence I have translated *muta* by "sensed" and not by "thought," although etymologically "thought" may be more correct. Possibly *muta*, as a term covering these three sense-functions, dates from a time prior to their differentiation. That *muta* does not include the sense-functions of the eye and ear suggests that these were recognised earlier than the others, their specific terminology emerging earlier. *Cf*. *VA*. 736; and *Bud. Psych. Ethics*, 2nd edn., 221, n. 1, for *muta* pointing to an older tradition of a time when the five senses had not been co-ordinated.

[5] *diṭṭha—suta—muta—viññāta*, combined at *D*. iii. 232, *M*. ii. 231, iii. 29, *Sn*. 1086, 1122, *Dhs*. 961, *It*. 121. At eight *Sn*. passages *d°*, *s°*, *m°* are combined, sometimes with other items, but not with *v°*. The first three may therefore belong to some old tradition, originally threefold, *viññāta* being added later with the rise of interest in mind, *manas*, of which *viññāta* is here a function. See *S*. i. 270= *Thag*. 1216, where *d°*, *s°*, *m°* are combined with *paṭigha*; and *cf*. *SA*. i. 270. See also *Pss. Breth*. 398, n. 9, *K.S*. i. 237, n. 1; and *Bud. Psych. Ethics*, 2nd edn., p. 221, n. 1, for Upaniṣad references.

heard, not sensed what I have sensed, not cognised what I have cognised."

Not seen means: not seen by the eye. Not heard means: not heard by the ear. Not sensed means: not smelt by the nose, not tasted by the tongue, not felt[1] by the body. Not cognised means: not cognised by the mind.

Seen means: seen by the eye. Heard means: heard by the ear. Sensed means: smelt by the nose, tasted by the tongue, felt by the body. Cognised means: cognised by the mind. || **1** ||

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie[2] that, "In three ways I have seen what I have not seen": before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; having lied he knows, "I lied."

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In four ways I have seen what I have not seen": before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; having lied he knows, "I lied," misrepresenting his opinion.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In five ways . . . I lied," misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval. [2]

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In six ways . . . I lied," misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In seven ways . . . I lied," misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure, misrepresenting his intention.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways I have heard what I have not heard" . . . ". . . sensed what I have not sensed" . . . ". . . cognised what I have not cognised": before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie"; while lying he knows, "I am lying"; having lied he knows, "I lied."

---

[1] *phuṭṭhaṃ*. [2] From here to end of **2**, 6 *cf. B.D.* i. 162-171.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In four ways . . . in five ways . . . in six ways . . . in seven ways . . ." misrepresenting his intention. || 2 ||

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have seen and heard what I have not seen " . . . for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have seen and sensed what I have not seen " . . . " . . . I have seen and cognised what I have not seen " . . . " . . . I have seen and heard and sensed what I have not seen " . . . " . . . I have seen and heard and cognised what I have not seen " . . . " . . . I have seen and heard and sensed and cognised what I have not seen."

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have heard and sensed what I have not heard " . . . " . . . I have heard and cognised what I have not heard " . . . " . . . I have heard and seen what I have not heard " . . . " . . . I have heard and sensed and cognised and seen what I have not heard."

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have sensed and cognised what I have not sensed " . . . " . . . I have sensed and cognised and heard and seen what I have not sensed."

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have cognised and seen what I have not cognised " . . . " . . . In three ways I have cognised and seen and heard and sensed what I have not cognised." || 3 ||

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have seen what I have not seen . . . heard what I have not heard . . . sensed what I have not sensed . . . cognised what I have not cognised." || 4 ||

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, " In three ways I have seen what I have heard

. . . I have seen what I have sensed . . . I have seen what I have cognised."

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways I have seen what I have heard and what I have sensed . . . I have seen what I have heard and what I have cognised . . . I have seen what I have heard and what I have sensed [3] and what I have cognised" . . . ". . . I have cognised what I have seen and what I have heard and what I have sensed." || 5 ||

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In three ways he is in doubt as to what he has seen: he does not trust what he has seen, he does not remember what he has seen, he becomes confused as to what he has seen.[1] He is in doubt as to what he has heard: he does not trust what he has heard, he does not remember what he has heard, he becomes confused as to what he has heard.[1] He is in doubt as to what he has sensed . . . He is in doubt as to what he has cognised . . . he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and seen by me'; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and heard by me'; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and sensed by me'; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and seen and heard by me'; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and seen and sensed by me'; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and seen and heard and sensed by me.'"

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, "In four ways . . . in five ways . . . in six ways . . . in seven ways he is confused as to what he has cognised, saying: 'It was cognised and seen and heard and sensed by me.'" (These are the seven ways): before he has lied he knows, "I am going to lie";

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 284.

while he is lying he knows, " I am lying "; having lied he knows, " I lied," misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure, misrepresenting his intention. || 6 ||

There is no offence if he speaks in jest,[1] if he speaks in fun. He speaks in jest means he speaks in haste[2]; he speaks in fun means, saying: ' I will speak of this,' he speaks of that[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrongdoer. || 7 || **2** ||

The First

[1] *davā.*

[2] *sahasā* ; *VA.* 737, without considering or reflecting.

[3] As saying *cīvaraṃ* for *cīraṃ*, *VA.* 737. It is very unusual, if not unique, for commentarial exegesis to occur in the " no offence " paragraph.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) II

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, the group of six monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insulted the well behaved monks; they jeered at them, they scoffed at them about birth and name and clan and work and craft and disease and distinguishing mark and passion[1] and attainment[2] and low mode of address.[3] Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" How can this group of six monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, [4] insult the well behaved monks ? How can they jeer at them, scoff at them about birth . . . low mode of address ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insulted the well behaved monks, jeered at them . . . about low mode of address ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insult the well behaved monks, jeer

---

[1] *kilesa.* [2] *āpatti.*

[3] *akkosa. C.P.D.* gives " abuse, scolding, reviling," and *P.E.D.* " shouting at, abuse, insult, reproach, reviling." But from the distinction drawn by the *Old Comy.* below, p. 177, between *hīna* and *ukkaṭṭha akkosa,* these words must mean the ways in which you accost or address a person, either with insult or with respect. That the word *akkosa* came to mean " cursing " is evident from the compound *akkosavatthu,* (the ten) ways of cursing, referred to at *Jā.* i. 191, which is founded on this *Vin.* story. These ways are also referred to at *VA.* 625; *SnA.* 364, 467; and *DhA.* i. 212= *SnA.* 342, where ten curses are enumerated. These vary somewhat from those given below in the *Old Comy.*

at them, scoff at them about . . . low mode of address? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ." And having rebuked them and given dhamma-talk, he addressed the monks, saying: || 1 ||

"Formerly, monks, at Takkasilā,[1] Nandivisāla was the name of an ox belonging to a certain brahmin. Then, monks, Nandivisāla, the ox, spoke thus to the brahmin: 'Brahmin, you go, bet a thousand[2] with the great merchant,[3] saying: "My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together."' Then, monks, that brahmin made a bet of a thousand with the great merchant, saying: 'My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together.' Then, monks, that brahmin having tied together a hundred carts, having yoked Nandivisāla, the ox, spoke thus: 'Go, hornless one,[4] let the hornless one pull them along.'[5] Then, monks, Nandivisāla, the ox, stood just where he was. Then, monks, that brahmin, having suffered the loss[6] of a thousand, was overcome by grief.[7] Then, monks, Nandivisāla, the ox, spoke thus to the brahmin: 'Why are you, brahmin, overcome by grief?'

'Because I, good sir,[8] suffered the loss of a thousand through you.'

'But why do you, brahmin, bring me, who am not hornless, into disgrace with words of deceit?[9] Brahmin, you go, bet two thousand with the great merchant, saying: "My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together," but do not bring me, who am not hornless, into disgrace with words of deceit.'

Then, monks, that brahmin bet two thousand with the great merchant, saying: 'My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together.' Then, monks, that brahmin having

[1] Modern Taxila. Story given again, with slight variations, at *Jā.* i. 191.

[2] "Pieces," probably *kahāpaṇas* to be understood.

[3] *seṭṭhi*, see above, p. 42, n. 4.

[4] *kūṭa*, not horned, therefore harmless. *Jā. Transl.* has "rascal." Such maimed beasts had not a good reputation for work, *Vism.* 268, 269. *Kūṭa* also means false, deceitful.

[5] *vahassu.* [6] *parājita*, with instr. [7] *pajjhāyi.*

[8] *bho.* [9] *kūṭavāda*, or "words about being hornless."

tied together a hundred carts, having yoked Nandivisāla, the ox, spoke thus: 'Go, good creature,[1] let the good creature pull them along.' Then, monks, Nandivisāla, the ox, drew the hundred carts tied together.

Speak only words of kindness,[2] never words
Unkind. For him who spoke him fair, he moved
A heavy load, and brought him wealth, for love. [5]

At that time, monks, jeering and scoffing were not liked by me, so however could jeering and scoffing become liked now? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In insulting speech[3] there is an offence of expiation."
||2||1||

Insulting speech means: he insults in ten ways: about birth and name and clan and work and craft and disease and distinguishing mark and passion and attainment and mode of address.

Birth means: there are two kinds of birth: low birth and high birth. *Low birth* means: birth as (a member of) a despised class,[4] birth as a bamboo-plaiter,[5] birth as a hunter,[6] birth as a cartwright,[7] birth as a refuse-

[1] *bhadra.*

[2] *manāpa. Jā.* i. 193 reads *manuñña* throughout. This seems to be a later word, see *P.E.D.* references.

[3] *omasavāde.*

[4] *caṇḍāla.* These five kinds of birth occur again at *e.g. M.* ii. 152, 183, iii. 169, *S.* i. 93, *A.* i. 107, ii. 85, *Pug.* 51.

[5] Or basket-weaver, *veṇa. VA.* 738 says *veṇajātî ti tacchakajāti veṇukārajāti* (with *v.l. veḷu°*), birth as a *veṇa* means birth as a carpenter, birth as a bamboo-worker. At *Jā.* v. 306, *veṇī* is explained by *tacchikā*, a female carpenter. *SA.* i. 162=*AA.* ii. 175 paraphrase *vena* by *vilīvakāra*, a worker in bamboo, basket-maker. *Quest. Milinda* ii. 211 (*S.B.E.*) has "savages," and see *loc. cit.*, n. 2.

[6] *nesāda. VA.* 738=*SA.* i. 162=*AA.* ii. 175=*PugA.* 227 explain by *migaluddaka*, a hunter or trapper. *Quest. Milinda*, ii. 211 has "wild men of the woods," with note that Sinhalese simply says "Weddahs, the well-known, interesting wild men of Ceylon."

[7] *rathakāra*, or carriage builder, chariot maker. *VA.* 738=*SA.* i. 162=*AA.* ii. 175=*PugA.* 227=*Jā.* iv. 174 explain by *cammakāra*, usually a leather-worker. *Cammakāra* occurs below, p. 176, among

scavenger[1]—this means low birth. *High birth* means: birth as a noble, birth as a brahmin—this means high birth.

Name means: there are two (kinds of) name: low name and high name. *Low name* means: Avakaṇṇaka,[2] Javakaṇṇaka, Dhaniṭṭhaka, Saviṭṭhaka, Kulavaḍḍhaka, or what is disdained,[3] disregarded,[4] scorned,[5] treated with contempt,[6] despised[7] in these districts—this means low name. *High name* means: connected with the enlightened one,[8] connected with dhamma, connected with the Order, or what is not disdained, not disregarded, not scorned, not treated with contempt, what is esteemed in these districts—this means high name.

Clan[9] means: there are two (kinds of) clan: low clan

---

the low crafts, while *rathakāra* is among the low kinds of birth; but there seems to be no correspondence between the kinds of low birth and the kinds of low craft, such as would enable one to say that a man of such-and-such a birth follows such-and-such a trade or craft. See *Dial.* i. 100, 102, which distinguishes those who are low by birth and those who follow low occupations, and which draws the inference that there "was no hard-and-fast line, determined by birth, for those who gained their living by these trades." *Miln.* 331, in a long list of people, gives both *rathakāra* and *cammakāra*, as though these represented two different types of occupation. I therefore think that at all events at some time these two words had two distinct meanings.

[1] *pukkusa. VA.* 738=*SA.* i. 162=*AA.* ii. 175 paraphrase as *pupphacchaḍḍaka*, lit. a scavenger of flowers, see below, p. 175. On Pukkusa as a proper name see *Dial.* ii. 141, n., and *D.P.P.N.* Sometimes, as at *A.* i. 162, iii. 214, we get *caṇḍāla-pukkusa.* For note on the insertion of the three other kinds of birth (*veṇakāra*, *nesāda*, *rathakāra*) between *caṇḍāla* and *pukkusa* see *Dial.* i. 100. Here also the *hereditary* nature of these, as occupations, is discussed. It is clear that none of the five is included under *sūdra*, the lowest of the four *vaṇṇa* (colour, caste) or *kula* (family), from which the caste-system probably derived.

[2] These five are, according to *VA.* 738, the names of slaves. *Kulavaḍḍhaka* look as though they were of caste on one side only, *kula*+*aḍḍhaka*, thus not of good family; or that they were low caste people trying to become higher caste people, *kula*+*vaḍḍhaka*.

[3] *oññāta.* [4] *avaññāta.* [5] *hīlita.* [6] *paribhūta.*

[7] *acittikata.*

[8] *buddha- dhamma- saṅgha-paṭisaṃyutta*, not Buddharakkhita, etc., as at p. 179 below and *Vin.* iii. 169. [9] *gotta.*

and high clan. *Low clan* means: a Kosiya clan,[1] a Bhāradvāja clan,[2] or what is disdained, disregarded, scorned, treated with contempt, despised in these districts—this means low clan. *High clan* means: a Gotama[3] clan, a Moggallāna clan, a Kaccāyana clan,[4] a Vāsiṭṭha clan,[4] or what is not disdained . . . what is esteemed in these districts—this means high clan.

Work means: there are two (kinds of) work: low work and high work. *Low work* means: work of a store-room (keeper),[5] work of a flower-scavenger,[6] or what is disdained . . . despised in these districts—this means low work. *High work* means: agriculture,[7] trade,[8] cattle-keeping,[9] or what is not disdained . . . what is esteemed in these districts[10]—this means high work.

---

[1] A brahmin clan; see *D.P.P.N.*

[2] Another brahmin clan; see *D.P.P.N.*

[3] *Cf. D.* ii. 3. These four clan or family names occur at *Vin.* iii. 169.

[4] See *D.P.P.N.*

[5] *koṭṭhakakamma. VA.* 739 paraphrases as *tacchakakamma*, carpenter's work. At *Jā.* v. 306 *veṇī*, female bamboo-worker, is explained by *tacchikā. Koṭṭhaka* is usually the store-room itself.

[6] *pupphacchaḍḍakakamma*, the work of the person whose duty it was to remove dead flowers which had been offered at shrines but not removed by the devotees themselves. It was a low hereditary trade to which, *e.g.*, Sunīta belonged, see *Pss. Breth.*, p. 271 and ver. 620, where he says that he was born in a low family (*nīca kula*).

[7] *kasi*. This and the two following occur at *M.* i. 85, *Miln.* 178. *Kasikamma* translated at *Fur. Dial.* i. 60 "being an estate-agent."

[8] *vāṇijjā*, translated at *Fur. Dial.* i. 60 "purveyor," and explained at *MA.* ii. 56 as trade on water and trade on land.

[9] *Gorakkhā*, translated at *Fur. Dial.* i. 60 "herd-manager." *MA.* ii. 56 explains it as "minding cows for self or others, there is work and livelihood by bartering (*vikkaya*, or selling) the five products of the cow," while *MA.* iii. 435=*SnA.* 466 explains it by *khettarakkha kasikamma*, minding the fields, agriculture, and says that *go* is a name for *paṭhavī*, the earth. I see, however, no reason for adopting this interpretation here. These three types of work are mentioned at *Pv.* I. 5.

[10] These examples of despised and esteemed work are not monks' but lay-people's work. This looks like a fragment of original Sakya "left in" from a time when the Founder had the lay-people in mind as well as monks and nuns.

Craft[1] means: there are two (kinds of) craft: low craft and high [6] craft. *Low craft* means: the craft of the basket-maker,[2] the potter's craft, the weaver's craft, the leather-worker's[3] craft, the barber's craft, or what is disdained . . . despised in these districts—this means low craft. *High craft* means: reckoning on the fingers,[4] calculation,[5]

[1] *sippa*, craft or occupation. Eight are mentioned at *M.* i. 85; another list is at *Ud.* 31-32. At *D.* i. 51 all the crafts, except the leather-worker's, termed "low" by *Vin.* above, are enumerated under ordinary (*puthu*) crafts. Here also are included those who follow the crafts of "calculation" and "counting on the fingers" (*gaṇaka*, *muddika*, see below, notes, 4, 5), termed "high crafts" above. [2] *naḷakāra*, worker in reeds or rushes.

[3] *cammakāra*, see above, p. 173, n. 7.

[4] *muddā*. Occurs, *e.g.*, at *D.* i. 11 (with *gaṇanā*, among the wrong means of livelihood); *M.* i. 85 (with *gaṇanā*, among the *sippāni*); *Ud.* 31 (with *gaṇanā* and, p. 32, *lekhā*), *Miln.* 3, 59 (with *gaṇanā* and *lekhā* as *sippāni*), 78, 79 (with *gaṇanā*), 178 (with *lekhā*). The exact meaning of *muddā* is uncertain. It has been translated at *Dial.* i. 21 "counting on the fingers"; *Fur. Dial.* i. 60 "clerk of the signet"; *Minor Anthol.* ii. (*S.B.B.* viii.) 38 "craft of signs manual"; *Quest. Milinda* i. 6 "conveyancing." *VA.* 739=*DA.* 95 explain by *hatthamuddagaṇanā*, which seems doubtful since in the texts referred to above *muddā* and *gaṇanā* are two separate things. The explanation given at *MA.* ii. 56 is the more probable: *aṅguli-pabbesu saññaṃ ṭhapetvā hatthamuddā*, establishing recognition at the finger-joints, there is *muddā* (reckoning, computing) by (using) the hands. See on *muddā*, *Dial.* i. 21, n. 4, and where it is explained as "arithmetic, using the joints or knuckles of the fingers as an aid to memory." *Miln.* 79 says that memory arises from *muddā*, as when "he knows from his training in *lipi* (? writing) that this syllable is to follow that syllable." On *muddā*, see also *Minor Anthol.* ii. 38, n. 2, as a method of private bargaining in which the dealer and the merchant clasp each other's hands, the merchant then making various recognised signs: "holding the joints of the dealer's fingers, a certain number of fingers, or tapping on his palm." See also *Quest. Miln.* i. 91, n. 1. *Cf. Mudrā* as hand-gesture.

[5] *gaṇanā*. Word occurs, *e.g.*, at *D.* i. 11, *M.* i. 85, *Ud.* 31, *Vin.* i. 77=iv. 128, *Miln.* 59, 78; see previous note. According to *C.P.D.* *gaṇanā* means "the counting (of numbers) in unbroken series," in contradistinction to the last, as noticed by Rhys Davids, *Dial.* i. 22, n. 1. *VA.* 739=*DA.* i. 95=*MA.* ii. 56=*UdA.* 205 explain by *acchiddaka* (*v.ll.* *acchinnaka-*, *acchindaka-*) *gaṇanā*. At *Vin.* i. 77= iv. 128 both *gaṇanā* and *lekhā* are considered unsuitable occupations for the boy Upāli to study. At *D.* i. 11 and *Ud.* 31-32 *muddā* and *gaṇanā* are followed by *saṅkhānā*, reckoning, with *lekhā* coming next to this. See *S.B.B.* VIII. 38 and notes, and *Quest. Miln.* i. 91, n. 2.

writing,[1] what is not disdained . . . what is esteemed in these districts—this means high craft.

All *diseases* are low, except that diabetes[2] is a high (kind of) disease.

Distinguishing mark[3] means: there are two (kinds of) distinguishing mark: low distinguishing mark and high distinguishing mark. *Low distinguishing mark* means: (being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair—this means low distinguishing mark. *High distinguishing mark* means: not (being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair—this means high distinguishing mark.

All *passions*[4] are low.

All *attainments*[5] are low, except that stream-attainment and higher attainment[6] are high.

Mode of address[7] means: there are two modes of

---

[1] *lekhā*. Word occurs at *Ud.* 32, *Miln.* 59, 178; see above, p. 176, n. 4. Also at *Vin.* i. 77=iv. 128 (see previous note). At *Vin.* iii. 76 we find: "He praises by means of writing (*lekhāya*) means: if he cuts a writing there is a dukkaṭa offence for each syllable (*akkharakkharāya*)," while at *Vin.* iv. 305 there is no offence for a nun to learn what is written. *VA.* 739 explains by *akkhara-lekhā*, writing, tracing, scratching or engraving syllables, as on a piece of metal, wood, a leaf or clay; see *VA.* 452. Some such process was probably known in India before writing as we understand it. *UdA.* 205 says that the craft of writing (*lekhā-sippa*) is "the craft of writing (*likhana*) syllables in various ways, or the knowledge of writing (*likhā*)." See *B.D.* i. 131, n. 1. These *sippāni*, like the *kammāni* above, p. 175, were not intended to be followed by monks, and the distinction between "high" and "low" is probably mainly for the laity, although it gives the monks a guide as to the social standing of the laity.

[2] *madhumeha*. *P.E.D.* suggests diabetes, and it is so translated at *G.S.* v. 75.

[3] *liṅga*, or characteristic. *Cf. Vin.* iii. 169.

[4] *kilesa*.

[5] At *Vin.* ii. 93 *sota-* and *sam-âpatti* are called *āpattis* not subject to legal question. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 44, n. The play on the words *āpatti*, *sot-âpatti*, *sam-âpatti* cannot well be reproduced in English if we regard *āpatti* in its more secondary sense of "fault, transgression, offence," as seems to be the usual meaning in *Vin.*, and as the translators of *D.* iii. 212, *A.* i. 84, 94, *Dhs.* 1329 take it. When *āpatti* is combined with *sota-* and *sam-* it has the more primary meaning of acquiring, obtaining, entering into a relationship with. On *āpatti* as an offence, see *Bud. Psych. Ethics*, 2nd edn., p. 321.

[6] *sam-âpatti*. For note on the *samâpattis* see *Bud. Psych. Ethics*, 2nd edn., p. 321, n.

[7] See above, p. 171, n. 3.

address: low mode of address and high mode of address. *Low mode of address* means: he says, "You are a camel, you are a ram, you are an ox, you are an ass, you are an animal, you are (destined) for a state of woe,[1] a good bourn is not for you, but a bad bourn is to be expected for you," or by adding *ya* or *bha* (to the end of his name),[2] or by calling him male and female[3]—this means low mode of address. *High mode of address* means: he says, "You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you are clever, you are a speaker of dhamma,[4] a bad bourn is not for you, but a good bourn is to be expected for you"—this means high mode of address. || 1 ||

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at, desiring to scoff at, desiring to shame[5] one who is ordained speaks of a low thing—(a member of) a despised class, a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger, with low words and says: "You are (a member of a) despised class, you are a bamboo-plaiter, you are a hunter, you are a cartwright, you are a refuse-scavenger," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at . . . desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing—a noble, a brahmin, with low words and says: "You are (a member of) a despised class . . . you are a refuse-scavenger," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at . . . desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing—(a member of) a despised class . . . a refuse-scavenger, with high words and says: "You are a noble, you are

---

[1] *nerayika.*

[2] *yakārena vā bhakārena vā*—*i.e.*, as a diminutive and therefore as a disparaging ending.

[3] *kāṭakoṭacikā.*

[4] Inclusion here is characteristic of the respect in which the *dhamma-kaṭhika* was held.

[5] *maṅkuṃ kattukāmo.* *Cf. S.* v. 74, *Dhp.* 249, *Vin.* ii. 118, and Hardy, *A.* v., p. v.

a brahmin," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at . . . desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing —a noble, a brahmin, with high words [7] and says: "You are a noble, you are a brahmin," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at . . . desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing —an Avakaṇṇaka, a Javakaṇṇaka, a Dhaniṭṭhaka, a Saviṭṭhaka, a Kulavaḍḍhaka, with low words, for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing—a Buddharakkhita, a Dhammarakkhita, a Saṅgharakkhita[1] with low words and says: "You are an Avakaṇṇaka . . . you are a Kulavaḍḍhaka," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—a Kosiya, a Bhāradvāja with low words . . . speaks of a high thing—a Gotama, a Moggallāna, a Kaccāyana, a Vāsiṭṭha with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—a store-room keeper, a flower-scavenger with low words . . . speaks of a high thing —a cultivator,[2] a trader,[3] a cattle-keeper[4] with low words

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 292, and above, p. 174, which reads *buddha- dhamma-saṅgha-paṭisaṃyutta.*

[2] *kassaka*, or husbandman, ploughman; not as above, p. 175, agriculture or ploughing, *kasi.*

[3] *vāṇija ;* not *vāṇijjā*, trading, trade, as above, p. 175.

[4] Presumably this, in the acc. *gorakkhaṃ*, is in the nom. *gorakkha* here, and not *gorakkhā* as above, p. 175.

. . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—a basket-maker, a potter, a weaver, a leather-worker, a barber with low words . . . if he speaks of a high thing—a reckoner,[1] an arithmetician,[2] a scribe[3] with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—one afflicted with leprosy, with boils, with eczema, with consumption, with epilepsy[4] with low words . . . if he speaks of a high thing—one afflicted with diabetes with low words . . . if he speaks of a low thing with high words . . . if he speaks of a high thing with high words . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—(being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair, with low words—speaks of a high thing—not (being) very tall, not very short, [**8**] not very dark, not very fair with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing . . . of one obsessed[5] by passion, of one obsessed by hatred, of one obsessed

[1] *muddika*, so translated at *Dial.* i. 68. At *D.* i. 51 *muddika* is included under ordinary (*puthu*) crafts. Word occurs at *S.* iv. 376, translated *K.S.* iv. 267 "ready-reckoner." *SA.* iii. 113 defines as one who is good at computing by reckoning on the fingers. Above, p. 176, we had *muddā*.

[2] *gaṇaka*, or computer, accountant; also an ordinary craft at *D.* i. 51. Word also occurs at *S.* iv. 376, translated *K.S.* iv. 267 "accountant." *SA.* iii. 113 says it means one who is good at computing in unbroken series. Above, p. 176, we had *gaṇanā*.

[3] *lekhaka*, clerk or scribe, not mentioned at *D.* i. 51. But see *Miln.* 42.

[4] These are all included in list of diseases at *Vin.* ii. 271, *A.* v. 110, *Nd.* i. 17, 47, ii. 304.

[5] *pariyuṭṭhita*.

by confusion with low words . . . speaks of a high thing—of one without passion, of one without hatred, of one without confusion with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing with low words—of being guilty of an offence of defeat,[1] of being guilty of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, of being guilty of a grave offence, of being guilty of an offence of expiation, of being guilty of an offence which ought to be confessed, of being guilty of an offence of wrong-doing, of being guilty of an offence of wrong speech . . . speaks of a high thing—a stream-attainer with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—a camel, a ram, an ox, an ass, an animal, one (destined) for a state of woe, and says, "You are a camel . . . you are (destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for you but a bad bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a high thing—a learned person, an experienced, wise, clever person, one who is a speaker of dhamma with low words, and says, "You are a camel . . . but a bad bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks of a low thing—a camel . . . one (destined) for a state of woe with high words, and says, "You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you are clever, you are a speaker of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for you but a good bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . .

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 164.

speaks of a high thing—a learned person . . . and says, " . . . but a good bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of expiation. || 2 ||

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who is ordained, speaks thus, saying: " There are here some (members of) despised classes, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . speaks thus, saying: " There are here some nobles and brahmins," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame . . . [9] speaks thus, saying: " There are here some Avakaṇṇakas, Javakaṇṇakas, Dhaniṭṭhakas, Saviṭṭhakas, Kulavaḍḍhakas . . . Buddharakkhitas, Dhammarakkhitas, Saṅgharakkhitas . . . Kosiyas, Bhāradvājas . . . Gotamas, Moggallānas, Kaccānas, Vāsiṭṭhas . . . storeroom (keepers),[1] flower-scavengers . . . cultivators, traders, cattle-keepers . . . basket-makers, potters, weavers, leather-workers, barbers . . . reckoners, arithmeticians, scribes . . . those afflicted by leprosy, by boils, by eczema, by consumption, by epilepsy . . . those afflicted by diabetes . . . (those who are) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair . . . (those who are) not very tall, not very short, not very dark, not very fair . . . (those who are) obsessed by passion, obsessed by hatred, obsessed by confusion . . . (those who are) without passion, without hatred, without confusion . . . (those who are) guilty of an offence involving defeat . . . guilty of an offence of wrong speech . . . (those who are) stream-attainers . . . camels, rams, oxen, asses, animals, (those destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for these, but a bad bourn is to be expected for these . . . learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for these, but a good bourn is to be expected for these," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 3 ||

[1] *koṭṭhakā ; cf.* above, p. 175, where we had *koṭṭhakakamma.*

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who has been ordained, speaks thus, saying: " What now if these are (members of) a despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers ?" . . . saying: " What now if these are learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma ?", for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 4 ||

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who has been ordained, speaks thus, saying: " We are not (members of) a despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers " . . . saying, " We are not learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 5 ||

If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who is not ordained,[1] speaks of a low thing with low words, of a high thing with low words, of a low thing with high words, of a high thing with high words, of a learned person, of an experienced, wise, clever person, of a speaker of dhamma, saying: " You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you are clever, you are a speaker of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for you but a good bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.
If one who is ordained, desiring . . . to shame one who is not ordained, speaks thus: " There are here some members of low castes . . . , we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, not speakers of dhamma, [10] a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 6 ||

If one who is ordained, not desiring to jeer at, not desiring to scoff at, not desiring to shame one who is

[1] *Kankhā-vitaraṇi*, p. 83, says that here it is meant that nuns also are " not ordained."

ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing—of a (member of a) despised class, a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger with low words, and says: "You are (a member of) a despised class . . . you are a refuse-scavenger," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, desiring not . . . to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a high thing—a noble, a brahmin with low words, and says: "You are (a member of) a despised class . . . you are a refuse-scavenger" . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words—of a noble, a brahmin, and says: "You are a noble, you are a brahmin," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring . . . to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing with low words . . . speaks of a high thing with low words . . . speaks of a low thing with high words . . . speaks of a high thing with high words—of a learned person . . . " . . . but a good bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring . . . to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks thus: "There are here some (members of a) despised class . . . we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, we are not speakers of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech. || 7 ||

If one who is ordained, not desiring . . . to shame one who is not ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing with low words . . . of a high thing with low words . . . of a low thing with high words . . . of a high thing with high words—of a learned person . . . " . . . but a good bourn is to be expected for you," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring . . . to shame one who is not ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks thus: "There are here some (members of a) despised class . . . we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, we are not speakers of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech. || 8 ||

There is no offence if he is aiming at (explaining) the goal, if he is aiming at (explaining) dhamma, if he is aiming at (explaining) the teaching,[1] if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 9 || **2** ||

The Second [**11**]

---

[1] =*Vin.* iii. 130 (*B.D.* i. 218)=*Vin.* iv. 277. *VA.* 740 "praising the goal."

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) III

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks brought slander[1] against monks for quarrelling, for disputing, for engaging in contention[2]; hearing of this they were proclaimed[3] for that and this dissension; hearing of that they were proclaimed for this and that dissension, so that quarrels that had not arisen arose, and also quarrels that had arisen rolled on for becoming more, for expansion. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks bring slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this . . . they were proclaimed . . . for expansion."

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, brought slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this . . . they were proclaimed . . . for expansion ?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, bring slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this . . . they were proclaimed . . . for expansion. It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increase in those who are pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In slander by monks,[4] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

---

[1] *pesuññaṃ upasaṃharanti.*

[2] These three words are defined at *Vin.* iv. 150 as "engaging in legal questions," so it may be supposed that the "quarrels," etc., were of a doctrinal rather than of a personal nature.

[3] *akkhāyanti.*

[4] *bhikkhupesuññe.*

Slander means: slander comes to be in two ways: making dear[1] or desiring dissension.

One brings slander in ten ways: on account of birth[2] and on account of name and on account of clan and on account of work and on account of craft and on account of disease and on account of distinguishing mark and on account of passion and on account of attainment and on account of mode of address.

Birth means[3]: there are two (kinds of) birth: low birth and high birth. *Low birth* means: birth as (a member of) a despised class, birth as a bamboo-plaiter, birth as a hunter, birth as a cartwright, birth as a refuse-scavenger—this means low birth. *High birth* means: birth as a noble, birth as a brahmin—this means high birth . . . *Mode of address* means: there are two modes of address: low mode of address and high mode of address. *Low mode of address* means: he says, " You are a camel . . ." . . . by calling him male and female —this means low mode [12] of address. *High mode of address* means: he says, " You are learned . . . a good bourn is to be expected for you "—this means high mode of address. || 1 ||

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so calls him ' a (member of a) despised class,[4] a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger,' " for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so calls him ' a noble, a brahmin ' " . . . " So and so calls him ' an Avakaṇṇaka, a Javakaṇṇaka, a Dhaniṭṭhaka, a Saviṭṭhaka, a Kulavaḍḍhaka ' " . . . saying: " So and so calls him ' a camel, a ram, an ox,

[1] *piyakamyassa*. *VA*. 740, " he says, ' Thus will I become dear to him,' desiring to be dear himself."
[2] *Cf*. above, p. 171; here ablative is used throughout.
[3] For the rest of this Pāc., *cf*. Pāc. II.
[4] For this passage, *cf*. above, p. 178*f*.

an ass, an animal, one (destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for him, but a bad bourn is to be expected for him '," . . . saying: " So and so calls him 'learned, experienced, wise, clever, a speaker of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for him, but a good bourn is to be expected for him,' " for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so says that 'there are here some (members of a) despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers,' he does not say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained . . . brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so says that 'there are here some nobles, brahmins,' he does not say anything else, he says just this" . . . . " So and so says that, 'There are here some learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma, there is no bad bourn for these, but a good bourn is to be expected for these,' he does not say anything else, he just says this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained . . . brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so says, 'What now if these are (members of a) despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers?' He does not say anything else, he says just this" . . . " So and so says, 'What now if these are learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma?' He does not say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained . . . brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: " So and so says, 'We are (members of a) despised class' " . . . " So and so says, 'We are not learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of dhamma, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,' he does not

[13] say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 2 ||

If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, for each sentence there is an offence of expiation. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is not ordained, brings a slander against one who is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is not ordained, brings a slander against the one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 3 ||

There is no offence if he is not making dear, if he is not desiring dissension, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 4 || **2** ||

The Third

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) IV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, the group of six monks made lay-followers speak dhamma line by line[1]; the lay-followers were disrespectful, not deferential towards the monks, they did not live in harmony.[2] Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks make lay-followers speak dhamma line by line? The lay-followers are disrespectful . . . they do not live in harmony."

Then these monks told this matter to the lord . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, made lay-followers speak dhamma line by line, (and that) lay-followers . . . in harmony?"

"It is true, lord." The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, make lay-followers speak dhamma line by line, (so that) lay-followers . . . in harmony? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increase in those who are pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should make one who is not ordained speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

Whatever means: he who . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] *padaso*. *VA*. 741, *padaṃ=koṭṭhāsaṃ*. *Comy*. also calls *pada* a fourth part of a verse (*gāthāpāda*), the others being *anupada*, *anvakkhara*, *anuvyañjana*. *Cf*. *MA*. i. 2, where is given the number of *padas* and *akkharas* of which *Majjhima* is said to consist; see W. A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts*, I. xx., who also says, "eight letters (*akkhara*) are a *Pada*, four *Pada*, a *Gāthā*."

[2] *Cf*. *A*. iii. 14.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained. [14]

A line, the next line, every syllable, the next phrase. *A line*[1] means: starting together they end together.[2] *The next line*[3] means: starting singly they end together.[4] *Every syllable*[5] means: saying "form is impermanent" (*rūpaṃ aniccaṃ*) he drops *rū*.[6] *The next phrase*[7] means: while saying "form is impermanent," he[8] utters the sound, "feelings are impermanent." Whatever is line and whatever is next line and whatever is every syllable and whatever is next phrase, all this means *dhamma line by line.*

Dhamma means: spoken by the enlightened one,[9] spoken by disciples,[10] spoken to holy men,[11] spoken by

---

1 *pada*, see above, p. 190, n. 1.

2 *ekato paṭṭhapetvā ekato osāpenti*. *VA*. 741 says that beginning every line together with a novice, so it is ended together.

3 *anupada*. *VA*. 741 says *dutiyapada*. *VA*.'s assumption is that a *thera* and a novice are reciting a verse, *Dhp*. 1 being cited.

4 *pāṭekkaṃ paṭṭhapetvā ekato osāpenti*. A *thera* says the first line alone and a novice says the second line together with him, *VA*. 741.

5 *anvakkhara*. On *akkhara* see *B.D*. i. 132, n. 1. *VA*. 741 says, *anvakkharan ti ekekaṃ akkharaṃ*.

6 *run ti opāteti*, he drops *run*. *P.E.D*. gives "sound-particle" for *run*. *Cf*. *Jā*. i. 418, *sā run ti saddaṃ akāsi*. *V.ll*. of text are *ruppaṃ*, *rūpaṃ*; of *VA*., *rū*. The Sinh. version of *Vin*. reads, *rūpan ti osāpeti*, he ends at *rūpaṃ*; he thus drops (*opāteti*) *aniccaṃ*, which is not the same as dropping a single syllable out of one word, and which seems to be the offence.

7 *anubyañjana*. The offence here is for a *thera* and a novice to say "form" and "feelings" simultaneously, instead of the latter waiting to begin his line until the former has finished his.

8 The novice, see *VA*. 741-2.

9 *VA*. 742 says, "the whole Vinayapiṭaka, Abhidhammapiṭaka, Dhammapada, Cariyāpiṭaka, Udāna, Itivuttaka, Jātaka, Suttanipāta, Vimānavatthu, Petavatthu, the Brahmajāḷā and other Suttas."

10 *VA*. 742 says, "spoken by disciples belonging to the fourfold congregation: the Anaṅgaṇa, Sammādiṭṭhi, Anumāna, Cūḷavedalla, Mahāvedalla Suttas and others," all Majjhima Suttas. *MA*. ii. 67 records that the ancients call the Anumāna the Bhikkhupātimokkha.

11 *Isibhāsita*. *VA*. 742 says, "spoken to wanderers outside (the Sakyaputtiya Orders): the whole of the Paribbājakavagga," in the Majjhima.

devatās,[1] connected with the goal,[2] connected with dhamma.[3]

Should make speak[4] means: he makes (him) speak by line, for every line there is an offence of expiation. He makes (him) speak by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained (and) makes him speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained (and) makes him speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained (and) makes him speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence in making (him) recite it together,[5] in studying it together,[6] if while speaking he drops a

---

[1] *VA*. 742 says, "spoken by (or with) devas: the Devatāsaṃyutta, Devaputtasaṃyutta, Mārasaṃyutta, Brahmasaṃyutta, Sakkasaṃyutta," of the Saṃyuttanikāya.

[2] *atthupasaṃhito ti aṭṭhakathānissito;* so *VA*. 742, meaning apparently what is connected with the *Commentary*—a far cry from *attha* as originally the goal, the aim, the thing sought.

[3] *dhammupasaṃhito ti pāḷinissito;* so *VA*. 742, thus identifying *dhamma* with the text. This definition of *dhamma* occurs again below, p. 206. Again not the earlier meaning of *dhamma*.

[4] Below, p. 206, where same explanation is given for *deseyya*, should teach. According to *VA*. 742-3 it is an offence to speak line by line any matter included at the three Councils; also various suttas, named, but not so included; and various other compilations, enumerated, and called *abuddhavacana*.

[5] *VA*. 743, if taking an exposition with an unordained person, he speaks it with him.

[6] With one who is not ordained, so *VA*. 743.

phrase[1] usually familiar,[2] if he drops it while expounding,[3] if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 2 ||

The Fourth

[1] Text, *gandha* ; *VA.* 743 *gantha* with *v.l. gaṇṭha.*

[2] *VA.* 743 says that "if the half-line of a verse does not come (to him), but the rest comes, this is called *yebhuyyena paguṇagantho.*"

[3] *I.e.*, a sutta, so *VA.* 744.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) V

. . . at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī.[1] Now at that time lay-followers came to the monastery for the sake of hearing dhamma. When dhamma had been spoken, the monks who were elders went to their own dwelling-place,[2] (but) the monks who were novices lay down in a sleeping-place[3] just there in the attendance hall[4] together with the lay-followers, careless, thoughtless, naked, mumbling,[5] snoring.[6] The lay-followers[7] looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered sirs lie down in a sleeping-place careless, thoughtless, naked, mumbling, snoring?"

Monks heard these lay-followers who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, [15] criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks lay down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained?"

---

[1] See *B.D.* i. 247, for *Āḷavī*; and *Jā.* i. 160, for this story.

[2] *yathāvihāra.*

[3] *seyyaṃ kappeti.* It is clear from *Old Comy.* below that *seyyā* is to be taken as a separate word; hence I have added "in a sleeping-place." There is the verb *nipajjati,* to lie down, but not necessarily in a recognised sleeping-place.

[4] *upaṭṭhānasālā.* Monks and laymen can stay here for a night. The *upaṭṭhānasālā* means a hall where help and support is given, food and so on, by the *dāyakas* or benefactors, for the monks who come from outside. It is like the *dānasālā* of the present day in Ceylon.

[5] *vikūjamānā,* which *VA.* 744 paraphrases as *vippalapamānā.*

[6] *kākacchamānā,* which *VA.* 744 says is like making the noise of a crow, in the nose, emitting senseless noises. Also at *A.* iii. 299.

[7] *I.e.,* the first-mentioned ones, *VA.* 744.

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Then the lord,[1] having stayed at Āḷavī for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Kosambī. Going along on tour, he arrived in due course at Kosambī. The lord stayed there at Kosambī in the Badarikā monastery.[2] Monks spoke thus to the venerable Rāhula:

"Reverend Rāhula, a rule of training laid down by the lord says that there should be no lying down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained. Reverend Rāhula, find a sleeping-place."[3]

Then the venerable Rāhula, not obtaining a sleeping-place, lay down in a privy. Then the lord, getting up in the night towards morning, approached this privy, and having approached, he coughed and the venerable Rāhula also coughed.

"Who is here?" he said.

"It is I, lord, Rāhula," he said.

"Why are you sitting there, Rāhula?"

Then the venerable Rāhula told this matter to the

---

[1] Again, *cf. Jā.* i. 160-1, where this story is given in greater detail. The sudden appearance of Rāhula in the *Vin.* version gives the appearance of material left out.

[2] One of the four establishments for the Order at Kosambī.

[3] According to *Jā.* i. 161, before this rule was laid down, the monks had always welcomed Rāhula as though the place were his own. But from the day that it was laid down they would not give him a resting-place, for fear of transgressing.

lord. Then the lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk,[1] addressed the monks, saying:

" I allow you, monks, to lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained for two or three nights. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation." || 2 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk, the rest are called not ordained.[2]

More than two or three nights means: exceeding two or three nights. [16]

With means: together with.

Sleeping-place[3] means: if it is fully covered,[4] if it is fully closed round, if it is partially covered, if it is partially closed round.

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if at sunset on the fourth day a monk lies down[5] while one who is not ordained is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If one who is not ordained lies down while a monk is lying down,[6] there is an offence of expiation. Or if both lie down, there is an offence of expiation. If getting up, they lie down again, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

[1] At *Jā.* i. 161, Sāriputta is reprimanded by the lord, because if he did not know about Rāhula, what would he know about other youths? But in the *Vin.* version Rāhula, judging by the prefix *āyasmā* to his name, is considered as ordained. It was not therefore that ordained monks should not lie down with him, but that he should not lie down with unordained persons.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 191, where we get " setting aside monk and nun."

[3] *seyyā.* In the rule only the phrase *seyyaṃ kappeyya* occurs; this is explained next. Another definition of *seyyā* occurs below, p. 244.

[4] *I.e.*, by a roof.

[5] *nipajjati.*

[6] *bhikkhu nipanne, v.ll.* given at *Vin.* iv. 355.

If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If it is half covered, half closed round, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he stays for two or three nights; if he stays for less than two or three nights; if having stayed for two nights, departing before dawn on the third night, he stays again[1]; if it is fully covered (but) not fully closed round; if it is fully closed round (but) not fully covered; if it is partially uncovered, partially not closed round; if the monk sits down while one who is not ordained is lying down; if one who is not ordained sits down while the monk is lying down; or if both sit down; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Fifth

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 378.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) VI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Anuruddha, going to Sāvatthī through the country of Kosala, in the evening arrived at a certain village. Now at that time a rest-house[1] in that village had been made ready by a certain woman. Then the venerable Anuruddha approached that woman,[2] and having approached he spoke thus to that woman:

"Sister, if it does not inconvenience you, we would stay for one night in the rest-house."

"Do stay, honoured sir," she said.

But other travellers came up to that woman, and having come up, they spoke thus to that woman:

"Lady, if it does not inconvenience you, we would stay for one night [17] in the rest-house."

"But this master, the recluse, arrived first. If he allows it, do stay," she said.

Then these travellers approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"If it does not inconvenience you, honoured sir, we would stay for one night in the rest-house."

"Do stay, sirs," he said.

Then that woman, on account of his appearance, fell in love with the venerable Anuruddha. Then that woman approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached, she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"Honoured sir, the master will not be comfortable,

---

[1] *āvasathâgāran ti āgantukānaṃ vasanāgāraṃ*, a dwelling-house for those coming in, *VA*. 750. *Cf*. *āvasatha-piṇḍa*, below, p. 303.

[2] *VA*. 750 says that he had heard of this resting-place from other people.

crowded with these people. Honoured sir, it would be good if I were to prepare a couch within for the master."

The venerable Anuruddha consented by becoming silent.

Then that woman, having prepared a couch within for the venerable Anuruddha, having decked herself up in ornaments,[1] smelling of perfumes, approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"Honoured sir, the master is beautiful, good to look upon, charming; I also am beautiful, good to look upon, charming. It were good, honoured sir, if I were to become the master's wife."

When she had spoken thus, the venerable Anuruddha was silent. A second time. . . . A third time that woman spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"Honoured sir, the master is beautiful, good to look upon, charming; I also am beautiful, good to look upon, charming. Pray, honoured sir, let the master take me as well as all the wealth."

A third time the venerable Anuruddha became silent. Then that woman, having slipped off[2] her outer cloak, walked up and down before the venerable Anuruddha, then she stood, then she sat down, then she lay down. Then the venerable Anuruddha, keeping control over (his) faculties,[3] neither so much as looked at that woman nor addressed her. Then that woman said:

"Indeed it is wonderful, good sir, indeed it is marvellous, good sir, many men send for me with a hundred[4] or a thousand,[4] but this recluse, being himself begged by me does not desire to take me as well as all the wealth," and dressing in her outer cloak, saluting

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 161.

[2] *nikkhipitvā*, *ni+khipati*, to put down or off.

[3] *okkhipitvā*, *ava+khipati*, to cast or throw down; fig. usually applied to the eyes, and thence to the other senses; thus meaning to control, to have under control. *Cf. A.* iv. 254, where Anuruddha again *indriyāni okkhipi*.

[4] *kahāpaṇas* presumably.

the feet of the venerable Anuruddha with her head, she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"Honoured sir, a transgression has overcome[1] me, in that I acted thus, foolish, misguided,[2] wrong that I was. Honoured sir, let the master acknowledge for me the transgression as a transgression for the sake of restraint in the future."

"Truly, sister, a transgression overcame you in that you acted thus, foolish, misguided, wrong that you were. But if you, sister, seeing the transgression as a transgression, [18] confess[3] according to the rule, we acknowledge it for you; for, sister, in the discipline of the noble, this is growth[4]: whoever, seeing a transgression as a transgression, confesses according to the rule, and[5] attains restraint in the future."

Then that woman, at the end of that night, having with her own hands satisfied and served the venerable Anuruddha with abundant food, both solid and soft, greeting the venerable Anuruddha when he had eaten and removed his hand from the bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Anuruddha gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted that woman with talk on dhamma. Then that woman, gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted by the venerable Anuruddha with talk on dhamma, said to the venerable Anuruddha:

"Excellent, honoured sir, it is excellent, honoured sir; even as one, honoured sir, would set upright what is overturned, or would uncover what is hidden, or would point out the way to one who is astray, or would bring out an oil lamp into the darkness, so that those with eyes could see forms—even so has dhamma been explained in many a figure by master Anuruddha. Honoured sir, I myself go to the lord as refuge, to dhamma and to the Order of monks; let the master

[1] Following passage=*D.* i. 85. *Cf.* also *M.* i. 438.

[2] *mūḷha,* or erring, infatuated, blind.

[3] *paṭikarosi.* Above, p. 8, the word translated "confess" was *deseti.*

[4] *Vuddhi h'esā ariyassa vinaye.*

[5] *ca* omitted at *D.* i. 85.

receive me as a lay-follower from this day forth, so long as life lasts, as one gone for refuge."[1]

Then the venerable Anuruddha, having gone to Sāvatthī, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Anuruddha lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Anuruddha, lay down in a sleeping-place with a woman?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, Anuruddha, lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman[2]? Anuruddha, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman, there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a little girl born this very day, all the more an older one.[3]

With means: together.[4]

Sleeping-place means: if it is fully covered, if it is fully closed round, if it is partially covered, if it is partially closed round.[5] [19]

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if at sunset a monk lies down when a woman is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If a woman lies down when

[1] A stock formula—*e.g.*, *D.* i. 85; *A.* i. 56.

[2] This seems unfair, as Anuruddha is shown not to have lain down with the woman. He was a cousin to Gotama, and one of his most eminent disciples. At *A.* i. 23 he is called chief of those of deva-like sight, a gift he highly prized; see *M.* i. 213.

[3] *Cf.* *B.D.* i. 202, 332.

[4] *sahâ ti ekato.*

[5] *Cf.* above, p. 196.

a monk is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both lie down there is an offence of expiation. If getting up, they lie down again, there is an offence of expiation.[1] || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a woman[2] when it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If it is half covered, half closed round, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he lies down in a sleeping-place with a female yakkha or with a female departed one or with a eunuch or with a female animal, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[3] If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is fully covered (but) not fully closed round, if it is fully closed round (but) not fully covered, if it is partially uncovered, partially not closed round, if the monk sits down while the woman is lying down, if the woman sits down while the monk is lying down, or if both sit down; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 3 || **2** ||

The Sixth

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 196; *Vin.* iv. 138.

[2] *Cf.* below, pp. 206, 358.

[3] *Cf.* below, pp. 207, 358.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 197.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) VII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin frequented families, and he approached many families. Then the venerable Udāyin, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, went up to a certain family. Now at that time the house-wife[1] was sitting at the entrance-door,[2] and the daughter-in-law of the house[3] was sitting at the door of the living-room.[4] Then the venerable Udāyin went up to the house-wife, and having gone up he gave dhamma privately[5] to the house-wife. Then the daughter-in-law of the house thought thus:

"What now, is this recluse the mother-in-law's lover, or is he speaking offensively?"

Then the venerable Udāyin, having given dhamma privately to the house-wife, approached the daughter-in-law of the house, and having approached he gave dhamma privately to the daughter-in-law of the house. Then the house-wife thought:

"What now, is this recluse the lover of the daughter-in-law of the house, [20] or is he speaking offensively?"

Then the venerable Udāyin, having given dhamma privately to the daughter-in-law of the house, departed. Then the house-wife said to the daughter-in-law of the house:

"Well now, what did this recluse say to you?"

"Lady, he taught dhamma to me[6]; but what did he say to the lady?"

"He also taught dhamma to me,"[6] she said.

---

[1] *gharaṇī=gharasāminī*, *VA.* 750=*PvA.* 174. *Cf. kulagharaṇī* at *S.* i. 201; *gharaṇī* at *Vin.* i. 271, *Pv.* iii. i. 9.

[2] *nivesanadvāre ti nivesanassa mahādvāre*, *VA.* 750.

[3] *gharasuṇhā.* [4] *āvasathadvāre ti ovarakadvāre*, *VA.* 750.

[5] *upakaṇṇake*, lit. into the ear.

[6] *me* the first time, *mayhaṃ* the second.

These (women) looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can master Udāyin teach dhamma privately? Should not dhamma be given clearly[1] and openly?"

Monks heard these women who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin teach dhamma to women?"[2]

Then these monks told this matter to the lord . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, taught dhamma to women?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, teach dhamma to women? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should teach dhamma to women, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time female lay-followers, seeing monks, spoke thus:

"Please, masters, teach dhamma."

"Sisters, it is not allowable to teach dhamma to women."

"Please, masters, teach dhamma in five or six sentences,[3] it is possible to learn dhamma in a few (sentences)."

---

[1] *vissatthena*, which *P.E.D.*, quoting *Vin.* ii. 99 (*vissaṭṭhena*), calls "in confidence." *VA.* 750 says, *vissaṭṭhenâ ti suniggatena saddena.*

[2] Note how the emphasis is shifted from "privately" to "to women"; probably such a shifting bears the mark of a later editorial hand, when women no longer occupied the comparatively high place that was theirs under early Buddhism.

[3] *vācā*, or word, saying, speech.

"Sisters, it is not allowable to teach dhamma to women," and being scrupulous, they did not teach. The female lay-followers looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these masters, being asked by us, not teach dhamma ?"

Monks heard these female lay-followers who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you to teach dhamma to women in five or six sentences. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should teach dhamma to women in more than five or six sentences, there is an offence of expiation." [21]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **2** ||

Now at that time the group of six monks thought: "It is allowed by the lord to teach dhamma to women in five or six sentences"; and these, making an unlearned man[1] sit down near by, taught dhamma to women in more than five or six sentences. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, making an unlearned man sit down near by, teach dhamma to women in more than five or six sentences ?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . to women ?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men . . . to women ? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet)

[1] *aviññuṃ purisaviggahaṃ.*

pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should teach dhamma to women in more than five or six sentences, except a learned man[1] (be present), there is offence of expiation." || 3 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal, one who is learned, competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.[2]

In more than five or six sentences means: exceeding five or six sentences.

Dhamma means: spoken by the enlightened one, spoken by disciples, spoken to holy men, spoken by *devatās*, connected with the goal, connected with dhamma.[3]

Should teach means: if he teaches by line, for every line there is an offence of expiation. If he teaches by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.[4]

Except a learned man (be present) means: setting aside a learned man.

A learned man means: one who is competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a woman[5] when it is a woman (and) teaches dhamma in more than five or six sentences, except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman (and) . . . except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it

[1] *viññunā purisaviggahena.* *VA.* 750 says, "not a yakkha, not a departed one, not an animal."

[2] =*B.D.* i. 215, 337.

[3] =above, p. 192.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 192, where there is the same explanation for *vāceyya* as here for *deseyya*.

[5] *Cf.* above, p. 202, below, p. 358.

is not a woman when it is a woman . . . except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he teaches dhamma in more than five or six sentences to a female yakkha or to a female departed one or to a eunuch [22] or to an animal in woman's form, except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if a learned man (be present); if he teaches dhamma in five or six sentences; if he teaches dhamma in less than five or six sentences; if he teaches having risen, having sat down again; if the woman having risen sits down again, and he teaches at that (moment)[1]; if he is teaching a different woman; if she asks a question; if (she) having asked a question, he speaks; if talking for the good of another, a woman hears[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **4** ||

The Seventh

[1] *tasmiṃ deseti ; VA.* 751, *tasmiṃ khaṇe deseti.*
[2] *Cf.* pp. 272, 275.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) VIII

. . . at Vesālī in the pavilion of the Gabled Hall in the Great Grove. Now at that time[1] many monks who were friends and companions went for the rains to the banks of the river Vaggumudā. At that time Vajjī was short of alms-food, which was difficult to obtain; it was suffering from a famine, and food-tickets were being issued. Nor was it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. Then these monks said to one another:

" At present Vajjī is short of alms-food . . . Nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. What now if we, by some strategem, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, should spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food ?"

Some spoke thus: " Look, your reverences, we could superintend the business of householders, thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food."

Some spoke thus: " Enough, your reverences, of superintending the business of householders. Look, your reverences, we will execute householders' commissions, thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food."

Some spoke thus: " Enough, your reverences, of superintending the business of householders and of executing householders' commissions. Look, your reverences, we will speak praise to householders concerning this or that

---

[1] *Cf.* Defeat IV, where it is an offence involving defeat unfoundedly to claim a condition of further-men (*uttarimanussa-dhamma*). See *B.D.* i. 151 ff. for notes.

condition of further-men, saying: 'Such a monk is possessed of the first [23] musing, such a monk is possessed of the second musing, such a monk is possessed of the third musing, such a monk is possessed of the fourth musing, such a monk is a stream-attainer, such a monk is a once-returner, such a monk is a non-returner, such a monk is man perfected, such a monk is a threefold wisdom man, such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man.' Thus these (householders) will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food. It is better, your reverences, to speak praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men."

Then these monks spoke praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men, saying, "Such a monk is possessed of the first musing . . . such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man." Then these (men) thought: "Surely we have gained, surely there is a profit for us that such monks have come to us for the rains. Surely such monks as these monks, virtuous and of good character, never came to us for the rains before." Accordingly these did not on their own account eat meals—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Accordingly these did not on their own account take savoury solid foods or drinks—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Thus these monks became handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear. || 1 ||

Now it was the custom for monks who had finished keeping the rains to go and see the lord. Then these monks who had finished keeping the rains, the three months having elapsed, packing away their bedding

taking their bowls and robes, went up to Vesālī. In the course of time they came up to Vesālī, the Great Grove, the pavilion of the Gabled Hall, and to the lord, and having approached the lord, they greeted him and sat down at a respectful distance. At that time the monks who had spent the rains in those regions had become lean, wretched, of a bad colour, having become very yellow, their veins standing out all over their bodies; but the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā had become handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear. Now it was the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks. So the lord said to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā: [24]

"I hope, monks, that things went well with you, I hope that you had enough to support life, I hope that, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, you spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food?"

"Things did go well with us, lord, we had enough to support life, lord, and all together we, lord, being on friendly terms and harmonious, spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food."

Tathāgatas knowing (sometimes) ask; knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Tathāgatas ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; the breaking of the bridge of the tathāgatas is among what does not belong to the goal. Enlightened ones, lords, question monks concerning two matters, either: "Shall we teach dhamma?" or, "Shall we make known a rule of training for disciples?"

Then the lord spoke thus to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā:

"In what way did you, monks, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Indeed, monks, I wonder if that is a fact?"

"It is a fact,[1] lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, monks, for the sake of your stomachs, speak praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should speak of a condition of further-men to one who is not ordained—if it is a fact,[2] there is an offence of expiation." ‖ 2 ‖ **1** ‖

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained.

Condition of further-men[3] means: musing, freedom, concentration, attainment, knowledge and insight, making the Way to become, realisation of the fruits, destruction of the corruptions, delight in solitude for the mind devoid of the hindrances.

Musing means: the first musing, the second musing, the third musing, the fourth musing.

Freedom means: void freedom, signless freedom, freedom in which there is no hankering.

Concentration means: void concentration, signless concentration, concentration in which there is no hankering.

Attainment means: void attainment, signless attainment, attainment in which there is no hankering. [25]

Knowledge and insight[4] means: the three knowledges.

Making the Way to become means: the four presences of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic potencies, the five faculties, the five powers,

[1] At *Vin.* iii. 89 (*B.D.* i. 154), the answer is, "It is not a fact," or it is a falsehood (*abhūta*).

[2] If it is not a fact, then there is a Pārājika offence (No. IV).

[3] From here to end of this Pāc., *cf. Vin.* iii. 92-100 (*B.D.* i. 161-171).

[4] At *Vin.* iii. 93, simply *ñāṇa*, knowledge.

the seven parts of enlightenment, the noble eightfold Way.

Realisation of the fruits means: realisation of the fruit of stream-attainment, realisation of the fruit of once-returning, realisation of the fruit of no-return, realisation of the fruit of perfection.

Destruction of the corruptions means: the destruction of passion, the destruction of hatred, the destruction of confusion.

For the mind devoid of the hindrances means: the mind devoid of the hindrance of passion, the mind devoid of the hindrance of hatred, the mind devoid of the hindrance of confusion.

Delight in solitude means: during the first musing there is delight in solitude, during the second musing . . . during the third musing . . . during the fourth musing there is delight in solitude. || 1 ||

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, " I will attain the first musing."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, " I am attaining the first musing."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, " I attained the first musing." . . . " I am possessed of the first musing . . . I am master of the first musing . . . The first musing is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: " I will attain the second . . . third . . . fourth musing. I am attaining the second . . . third . . . fourth musing. I attained the second . . . third . . . fourth musing. I am possessed of the . . . fourth musing. I am master of the . . . fourth musing. The . . . fourth musing is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: " I will attain . . . I am attaining . . . I attained the void freedom,

the signless freedom, the freedom in which there is no hankering, the void concentration, the signless concentration, the concentration in which there is no hankering, I am possessed of . . . I am master of the concentration in which there is no hankering, the concentration in which there is no hankering is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain . . . I am attaining . . . I attained the void attainment, the signless attainment, the attainment in which there is no hankering, I am possessed of . . . I am master of the attainment in which there is no hankering, the attainment in which there is no hankering is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain the three knowledges . . . I am possessed of the three knowledges . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: [26] "I will attain . . . I am possessed of the four presences of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic potencies . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain the five faculties, the five powers . . . I am possessed of . . . I am master of the five powers, the five powers are realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the seven parts of enlightenment . . . I am possessed of the seven parts of enlightenment . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the noble eightfold Way . . . I am possessed of the noble eightfold Way . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the fruit of stream-attainment, the fruit of once-

returning, the fruit of no-return, perfection . . . I am possessed of perfection . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "Passion is given up by me, hatred is given up by me, confusion is given up by me . . . renounced . . . sacrificed . . . destroyed . . . forsaken . . . thrown aside . . . rejected."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . of hatred . . . my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "In solitude I will attain the first musing . . . the second musing . . . the third . . . the fourth musing . . . in solitude I am possessed of the fourth musing . . ." || 2 ||

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the second musing . . . the second musing is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the third musing . . . the first musing and the fourth musing are attained by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the void freedom and the signless freedom and the freedom in which there is no hankering and the void concentration and the signless concentration and the concentration in which there is no hankering . . . is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the void attainment and the signless attainment and the attainment in which there is no hankering . . . is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain

the first musing and the three knowledges . . . is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, [27] "I will attain the first musing and the four presences of mindfulness and the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potencies . . . realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the five faculties and the five powers . . . realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the seven parts of enlightenment, and the noble eightfold Way, and the fruit of stream-attainment, and the fruit of once-returning, and the fruit of no-return, and perfection . . . realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing . . . I attained . . . and passion is given up by me, and hatred is given up by me, and confusion is given up by me, and . . . rejected."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing . . . I am attaining . . . realised by me . . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . of the hindrance of hatred . . . of the hindrance of confusion."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will enter upon the second musing and the third musing, and the second musing and the fourth musing . . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the second musing and the first musing . . attained by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion and I will attain

the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing . . . realised by me . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred . . ."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain . . . I am attaining . . . I attained the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing and the void freedom and the signless freedom and the freedom in which there is no hankering and the void concentration and the signless concentration and the concentration in which there is no hankering and the void attainment and the signless attainment and the attainment in which there is no hankering and the three knowledges and the four presences of mindfulness and the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potencies and the five faculties and the five powers and the seven parts of enlightenment and the noble eightfold Way [**28**] and the fruit of stream-attainment and the fruit of once-returning and the fruit of no-return and perfection and passion is given up by me . . . and hatred is given up by me . . . and confusion is given up by me, renounced, sacrificed, destroyed, forsaken, thrown aside, rejected, and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion." || 3 ||

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "I will attain the second musing"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "I will attain the third musing . . .

the fourth musing . . . the void freedom . . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the second musing," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, ". . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion" . . . for saying, for acknowledging . . . "I will attain the first musing . . ."; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "I will attain the first musing" . . . for saying, for acknowledging . . . ". . . My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing . . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the second musing and the third musing . . . and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "I will attain the first musing"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 4 ||

There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain . . . is attaining . . . attained the first musing, this monk is possessed of, master of

the first musing, the first musing is realised by this monk."

There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain . . . is attaining . . . attained the second musing, the third musing, the fourth musing, the void freedom . . . perfection . . . Passion is given up by this monk . . . hatred is given up [29] . . . confusion is given up by this monk, renounced . . . rejected. This monk's mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion . . . of hatred . . . is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain . . . is attaining . . . attained the first musing in solitude . . . the second musing . . . the third musing . . . the fourth musing in solitude . . . This monk is possessed of the fourth musing in solitude, is master of . . . The fourth musing is realised by this monk in solitude."

There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who uses your dwelling-place, who uses your robes, who uses your alms-food, who uses your lodgings, who uses your medicines for the sick . . . by whom your dwelling-place was used, by whom your robes were used, by whom your alms-food was used, by whom your lodgings were used, by whom your medicine for the sick were used . . . to whom, thanks to you, he gave a dwelling-place, he gave robes, he gave alms-food, he gave lodgings, he gave medicines for the sick, that monk attained the fourth musing in solitude . . . the fourth musing was realised by that monk in solitude." || 5 ||

There is no offence if he speaks of what is a fact[1] to one who is ordained; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 6 || **2** ||

The Eighth

[1] *bhūta*.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) IX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, came to be making a quarrel with the group of six monks. He, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen,[1] begged the Order for probation on account of this offence. The Order granted him probation on account of this offence. At that time a certain guild at Sāvatthī had food for the Order. He, being under probation, sat down in the refectory at the end of a seat. The group of six monks said to these lay-followers:

"Your reverences, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, an esteemed dependent of yours, is eating the gift of faith with the very same hand as that which he used to emit semen. He, [30] falling into the offence of intentional emission, begged the Order for probation on account of that offence. The Order granted him probation on account of that offence, so that being under probation, he is sitting at the end of a seat."

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks speak of a very bad offence[2] of a monk to one who is not ordained?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, spoke of a very bad offence of a monk to one who is not ordained?"

"It is true, lord."

---

[1] Formal Meeting I, *Vin.* iii. 112=*B.D.* i. 196. *Cf.* also *Pāc.* 64.

[2] *duṭṭhullā āpatti*. *Old Comy.* shows that *duṭṭhulla* means here something more general than "lewd" (*Vin.* iii. 128, 191-2; *B.D.* i. 215, 336-7). *Vin. Texts* i. 33 has "grave offence," but I am keeping this as a technical term for *thullaccaya*. *Cf. Kvu.* 163.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, speak of a monk's very bad offence to one who is not ordained? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should speak of a monk's very bad offence to one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks,[1] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Of a monk's means: of another monk's.

Very bad offence means: both the four involving defeat and the thirteen involving a formal meeting of the Order.[2]

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained.[3]

Should speak of means: should speak of to a woman or to a man or to one who leads the household life[4] or to one who has gone forth.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

There is agreement of the monks limited to offences,[5] not limited to families; there is agreement of the monks limited to families, not limited to offences; there is agreement of the monks limited to offences and limited to families; there is agreement of the monks neither limited to offences nor limited to families.

Limited to offences means: if he says: "he should be spoken to concerning just those offences,"[6] offences come to be taken up.[7]

Limited to families means: if he says: "he should be

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 15, 157.
[2] =*Vin.* iv. 128.
[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 191, 211.
[4] *gahaṭṭha.*
[5] *āpattipariyantā.* *Cf.* *Vin.* ii. 58, *āpattipariyantaṃ na jānāti, rattipariyantaṃ na jānāti*; translated at *Vin. Texts* ii. 416 "he was not aware of the degree of the offences and was not aware of the duration of the times." *Cf.* below, p. 371, *bhesajjapariyantā* and *rattipariyantā.*
[6] *ettakāhi āpattīhi.*
[7] *āpattiyo pariggahitāyo.*

spoken to among just those families," families come to be taken up.

Limited to offences and limited to families means: if he says: "he should be spoken to concerning just those offences among just those families," offences come to be taken up and families come to be taken up.

Neither limited to offences nor limited to families means: there come to be offences that are not taken up and there come to be families that are not taken up.

In "limited to offences," if setting aside those offences which come to be offences that are not taken up, he speaks about other offences, there is an offence of expiation. In "limited to families," if setting aside those families which come to be families that are not taken up, [31] he speaks among other families, there is an offence of expiation. In "limited to offences and limited to families," if setting aside those offences which come to be offences that are taken up, and if setting aside those families which come to be families that are taken up, he speaks about other offences among other families, there is an offence of expiation. In "neither limited to offences nor limited to families," there is no offence. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he tells of an offence that is not very bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he tells one who is not ordained of a transgression[1] which is very bad or which is not very

[1] *ajjhācāra*. Examples are given at *Vin.* iii. 121 (coming into physical contact with a woman), 128 (offending a woman by lewd speech); see *B.D.* i. 202, n. 3. At *Vin. Texts* i. 184 *ajjhācāra* is

bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1] || 2 ||

There is no offence if he speaks of an example but not of an offence; if he speaks of an offence but not of an example[2]; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Ninth

---

taken to be transgression in conduct, consisting in offences against the minor rules of the Pātimokkha. *Vin.* i. 172 is cited in support of this, for here failures in good behaviour, *ācāraṿipatti*, are said to be grave offences, those of expiation, those of confession, those of wrong-doing and those of wrong speech. This is what *VA.* 754 must be referring to when it says that " beginning with five rules, a transgression is called very bad; the rest are not very bad."

[1] This should surely read *anāpatti*.

[2] According to *VA.* 754 if he names some transgression done by someone, there is no offence; likewise if he merely mentions an offence into which a monk has fallen, beginning with a pārājika and going down to one of wrong speech, there is no offence. But if he names the type of offence and gives an example of it, such as saying, ' This (monk) has fallen into an offence involving a formal meeting of the Order, for having emitted impurely,' there is an offence for bringing forward (*ghaṭetvā*) the offence together with an example of it. The word translated as " example " is *vatthu*, matter, substance.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) X

. . . at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of Āḷavī, making repairs, dug the ground and had it dug. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, dig the ground and have it dug ? These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are harming life that is one-facultied."[1]

Monks heard these people who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" How can these monks of Āḷavī dig the ground and have it dug ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, dug the ground and had it dug ?"

" It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, dig the ground and have it dug ? For, foolish men, people having consciousness as living beings [**32**] are in the ground. It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should dig the ground or have it dug, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Ground means: there are two (kinds of) ground: natural ground and artificial ground.[2] *Natural ground* means: pure soil, pure clay, (with) few stones, (with)

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 156=*B.D.* i. 266 f.

[2] *jātā ca pathavī ajātā ca pathavī.*

few pebbles, (with) few potsherds, (with) little gravel,[1] (with) little sand, almost all soil, almost all clay. Natural ground is also called not burnt.[2] And whatever heap of soil or heap of clay is (left) damp[3] for more than four months, this too is called natural ground. *Artificial ground* means: pure stone, pure pebbles, pure potsherds, pure gravel, pure sand, little soil, little clay, almost all stones, almost all pebbles, almost all potsherds, almost all gravel, almost all sand. Artificial ground is also called burnt. And whatever heap of soil or heap of clay is (left) damp for less than four months, this too is called artificial ground.

Should dig means: if he himself digs, there is an offence of expiation.

Should have (it) dug means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. Commanding once, if he then digs many times, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is ground when it is ground (and) digs it or has it dug or breaks it or has it broken or burns it or has it burnt,[4] there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is ground (and) digs it . . . or has it burnt, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not ground when it is ground (and) digs it . . . or has it burnt, there is no offence. If he thinks that it is ground when it is not ground, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not ground, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not ground when it is not ground, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: "Find[5] this, give this, convey this, this is wanted, make this allow-

[1] *marumbā*, or perhaps coarse sand. At *Vin.* ii. 121 monks are allowed to spread *marumbā* in a damp or swampy cell. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 142, 153; also *Miln.* 197.

[2] By the potter.

[3] *ovaṭṭha ; VA.* 756 *ovaṭṭa* with *v.ll. ovuṭṭa, ovuṭṭha, ovaṭṭha.*

[4] Even by making a fire for cooking a bowl, *VA.* 758.

[5] *jāna* ; *VA.* 758 reads *jānāhi*, and indicates that these four activities refer to holes dug for stakes, to heavy clay, clay for chaff (*thusamattikā*) and soil.

able"; if it was unintentional,[1] if (he was) not thinking, if he did not know,[1] if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || 3 || **2** ||

The Tenth

This is its key:

Lying, insulting speech, slander, lines, then two on lying down,
Except a learned man (be present), facts, very bad offence, digging.

The First Division [**33**]

[1] =Below, pp. 229, 262, and *Vin.* iv. 125, 185, and *cf. Vin.* iii. 78 (*B.D.* i. 136).
[2] *Cf.* below, end of Pāc. XI.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XI

. . . at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of Āḷavī, making repairs, were cutting down trees and having them cut down; and a certain monk of Āḷavī cut down a tree, and the devatā living in that tree said to this monk:

"Do not, honoured sir, desiring to make an abode for yourself, cut down my abode."

This monk, taking no notice, cut it down, and in doing so, struck the arm of that devatā's son. Then it occurred to that devatā:

"What now if I, just here, should deprive this monk of life?" Then it occurred to that devatā:

"But this would not be suiting in me, that I were, just here, to deprive this monk of life. What now if I were to tell this matter to the lord?"

Then this devatā approached the lord, and having approached she told this matter to the lord.

"Very good, devatā, it is good that you, devatā, did not deprive this monk of life. If today you, devatā, had deprived this monk of life, you, devatā, would also have produced much demerit. You go, devatā; in a certain place there is a solitary tree, go you into it."

People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, cut down trees and have them cut down? These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are harming life that is one-facultied."[1] Monks heard these people who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

---

[1] As in Pāc. X.

"How can these monks of Āḷavī cut down trees and have them cut down?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, cut down trees and had them cut down?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, cut down trees and have them cut down? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

For destruction of vegetable growth[1] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Vegetable growth means: there are five kinds of propagation: (what is) propagated from roots, propagated from stems,[2] propagated from joints, propagated from cuttings,[3] and fifthly (what is) propagated from seeds.[4] [**34**]

Propagated from roots[5] means: turmeric, ginger, orris root, white orris root, garlic,[6] black hellebore, khus-

---

[1] *bhūtagāma;* translation taken from Mrs. Rhys Davids, *To Become or not to Become*, p. 118. *VA.* 761 says *gāmo ti rāsi*, and that standing green grass and trees is a synonym for *bhūtagāma*. *Dial.* i. 6 has "growing plants" for this word. This rule is referred to at *DhA.* iii. 302; *SnA.* 3. At *Miln.* 266 the destruction of *bhūtagāma* is said to be no sin in the eyes of the world, but a sin in the teaching of the Jina (an epithet for both Gotama and the Jain, Mahāvīra). *Cf. M.* i. 180=iii. 34.

[2] *khandhabīja.*

[3] *aggabīja. Dial.* i. 6: "propagated from buddings," with note that "it may mean 'graftings' if the art of grafting was then known in the Ganges valley." But the plants mentioned could not be propagated by buddings, which, moreover, does not seem to be a recognised botanical term. These plants *are* propagated by cuttings.

[4] For this list, *cf. D.* i. 5, iii. 44, 47 (=*Dial.* iii. 40, 42, "things grown from tubers, or shoots, or berries, or joints, or fifthly from seeds"), *S.* iii. 54 (=*K.S.* iii. 46, "root-seed, trunk-seed, seed from shoots, seed from joints, grain-seed, making five in all"); *cf. DA.* 77, *SA.* ii. 272.

[5] *Cf. DA.* 81 to end of || 1 || below.

[6] *ativisā*, or dried ginger; an antidote to poison.

khus,[1] nut-grass,[2] or whatever others are born from a root, arise from a root; this means propagated from roots.

Propagated from stems means: the fig-tree,[3] the banyan-tree, (a kind of) fig-tree,[4] (another kind of) fig-tree,[5] the Indian cedar wood,[6] the wood-apple,[7] or whatever others are born from a stem, arise from a stem; this means propagated from stems.

Propagated from joints means: sugar-cane, bamboo, reeds or whatever others are born from a knot, arise from a knot[8]; this means propagated from joints.

Propagated from cuttings means: basil,[9] camel-

[1] *usīra,* probably Andropogon muricatum. *Cf.* below, p. 240, where one of the four kinds of stools or settees (*koccha*) is made of *usīra.* At *Vin.* ii. 130 one of the three kinds of fans allowed is made of *usīra.* In some parts of the East the roots are woven into sweet-smelling mats and baskets and are used in making perfume.

[2] *bhaddamuttaka,* probably Cyperus rotundus. Has underground edible tubers. See *Vin.* i. 201, where these roots (or tubers) are allowed medicinally for flavouring foods which otherwise would be too unpalatable for ill monks to take. Decoction of these roots used today in Ceylon as medicine for fever and stomach complaints.

[3] This list is the same as that at *S.* v. 96.

[4] *pilakkha,* probably Ficus infectoria. "Wave-leafed," as at *K.S.* v. 80, is not a sufficient differentiation and is not the botanical name of any of the vast family of figs.

[5] *udumbara,* probably Ficus glomerata; of bunchy habit.

[6] Or Toon tree, *kacchaka.* Cedar suggested at *K.S.* v. 80. *P.E.D.* gives Cedrela Toona; *Path of Purity* II. 210 (=*Vism.* 183), "black fig."

[7] *kapiṭhana.* Var. readings are *kapitthaka, kapitthana, kapittana.* *P.E.D.* says that it is the tree Thespesia populneoides, as does Childers under *kapītano.* *K.S.* v. 80 and *Path of Purity* II. 210, both reading *kapitthaka,* render by "wood-apple." The Dictionaries, placing "wood-apple" under *kapiṭṭha, kapittha,* call it Feronia elephantum. There is, however, no family connection between Thespesia populneoides and Feronia elephantum. The former has a hard, dry, inedible fruit; the latter an edible fruit with a hard woody shell filled with a soft pulp, also used for medicinal purposes. Neither is a fig-tree (as tentatively suggested at *K.S.* v. 80), but Feronia is more like a fig, and would be meant if we were certain that the context was suggesting a tree with an edible fruit.

[8] *pabba,* joint, knot or section. Word hitherto translated as "joint" is *phaḷu.*

[9] *ajjuka.* *P.E.D.* and *C.P.D.* give Ocimum gratissimum. Probably the ordinary basil, Ocimum basilicum, is meant, as O. gratissimum is sometimes used as a synonym for this.

grass,[1] a kind of andropogon,[2] or whatever others are born from a cutting, arise from a cutting; this means propagated from cuttings.

Propagated from seeds means: grain, pulses,[3] or whatever others are born from a seed, arise from a seed; this means propagated from seeds. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a seed when it is a seed (and) cuts it or has it cut or breaks it or has it broken or cooks it or has it cooked, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a seed (and) cuts it . . . or has it cooked, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a seed when it is a seed (and) cuts it . . . or has it cooked, there is no offence. If he thinks that it is a seed when it is not a seed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a seed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a seed when it is not a seed, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: "Find this, give this, convey this, this is wanted, make this allowable"; if it was unintentional, if (he was) not thinking, if he did not know; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 3 || 2 ||

The First

---

[1] *phaṇijjaka=bhūtanaka*, *Jā*. vi. 536. Childers calls it the plant *samīraṇa*, which, according to Monier-Williams, is the plant *maruvaka*. (I cannot discover what is meant by this.) *P.E.D.* calls *bhūtanaka*, Andropogon schoenanthus. Camel-grass yields aromatic oil, mostly used for medicinal purposes.

[2] *hirivela*, occurring also at *Jā*. vi. 537. *P.E.D.* suggests as above. Monier-Williams gives *hrīvela*, a kind of perfume=*hrīvera*, a kind of drug and perfume (=*bāla*, *bālaka*). Under *bāla* he gives "a kind of perfume or fragrant grass, Andropogon schoenanthus." Childers also gives *hiriveraṃ*, a perfume, Andropogon schoenanthus.

[3] *Cf*. *B.D*. i. 83, n. 3.

[4] *Cf*. above, end of Pāc. X; also below, p. 262, and *Vin*. iv. 125. *VA*. 766 says that the clauses "Find this," etc., refer to medicines made from roots, to roots and leaves, to trees or creepers, to flowers and fruits, and to trees or creepers or fruits respectively. *VA*. 767 refers to an *anujānāmi* at *Vin*. ii. 109, in which monks are allowed to eat fruit that has become allowable to recluses in five ways.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XII

. . . at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa, having indulged in bad habits,[1] being examined for an offence[2] in the midst of the Order, shelved the question(s) by (asking) others,[3] saying, "Who has committed? What has he committed? On what ground has he committed? How has he committed? What do you say? Why do you say (it)?" Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, shelve the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: 'Who has committed . . . Why do you say (it)?'" . . .

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order . . . saying, '. . . Why do you say (it)?'? [35] . . . It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ." and having rebuked him and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, let the Order bring a charge of evasion[4] against the monk, Channa. And thus, monks, should he be charged: the Order should be informed

---

[1] As at *B.D.* i. 309. *Cf.* Channa at *Vin.* ii. 292, *D.* ii. 154.

[2] At *Vin.* ii. 88, when monks charge a monk with failure in conduct, *ācāravipatti*, there is a legal question arising out of censure.

[3] *aññen' aññaṃ paṭicarati*; *cf.* above, p. 164.

[4] *aññavādakaṃ ropetu. Aññavādaka* is the person who prevaricates, who evades the issue by talking about something else, "who prefers to talk about something else, shuffling and evading the thing in question" (*C.P.D.*). Verbal evasion only is meant, see *Old Comy.*

by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ' Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, shelved the question(s) by (asking) others. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should bring a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, Channa . . . by (asking) others. The Order brings a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa. If the bringing of a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa, seems right to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it does not seem right, they should speak. A charge of evasion is brought by the Order against the monk, Channa, and it is right . . . So do I understand.' "

Then the lord having rebuked the venerable Channa in many a figure for his difficulty in maintaining himself . . . " . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In evasion,[1] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, thinking, " Shelving the question(s) by (asking) others, I will fall into an offence," (so) having become silent, he vexed[2] the Order. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, having become silent, vex the Order ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, having become silent, vexed the Order ?"

" It is true, lord," he said.

---

[1] *aññavādake.*

[2] *tuṇhibhūto saṁghaṃ viheseti. VA.* 770 says that *vihesaka*, vexing, is a name for becoming silent.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How can you, foolish man . . . vex the Order? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ." and having rebuked him and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, let the Order bring a charge of vexing[1] against the monk, Channa. And thus, monks . . . (as above in ||**1**||; *instead of* evasion *read* vexing; *instead of* shelving the question(s) by (asking) others *read* having become silent, he vexes the Order) . . . should this rule of training be set forth:

In evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation."[2] ||**2**|| [**36**]

Evasion means: being examined in the midst of the Order on an example[3] or for an offence, not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward,[4] he shelves the questions by (asking) others, saying: 'Who has committed? What has he committed? On what ground has he committed? How has he committed? What do you say? Why do you say (it)?'—this means evasion.

Vexing means: being examined in the midst of the Order on an example or for an offence, not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, having become silent, he vexes the Order—this means vexing.

If he is not being charged with evasion (but) is being examined in the midst of the Order on an example or for an offence, (and) not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, he shelves the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: 'Who has committed? . . . Why do you say (it)?' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is not being charged with vexing (but) is

[1] *vihesakaṃ ropetu.*

[2] *aññavādake vihesake pācittiyaṃ. VA.* 770 says that in the two-fold matter there is a twofold *pācittiya.*

[3] *vatthusmiṃ ; cf. vatthu+āpatti* above, p. 222.

[4] *na ugghāṭetukāma.*

being examined . . . not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, having become silent, he vexes the Order, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is being charged with evasion (and) is being examined . . . he shelves the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: '. . . Why do you say (it)?', there is an offence of expiation. If he is being charged with vexing (and) is being examined . . . having become silent, he vexes the Order, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act[1] when it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.[2] || 2 ||

There is no offence if, not knowing, he asks; if, being ill, he does not speak; if, thinking: 'Quarrel or dispute or strife or contention will come to be for the Order,' he does not speak; if, thinking: 'There will come to be schism in the Order or dissension in the Order,'[3] he does not speak; if, thinking: 'He will carry out an (official) act[4] according to what is not the rule,[5] or by

[1] *adhammakamma*, expl. at *Vin*. i. 317.

[2] *Cf*. *B.D.* i. 302, 307, 313, 327; below, p. 237.

[3] *Cf*. *Vin*. iv. 128, 153, 217. *Saṁghabheda* and *saṁgharāji* discussed at *Vin*. ii. 303; referred to at *VbhA*. 428.

[4] Six kinds of *kamma*, official acts, given at *Vin*. i. 317.

[5] *adhammena*. *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 115, where it is allowed to protest against an (official) act that is being conducted according to what is not the rule.

an incomplete congregation,[1] or against one who is not suitable for an (official) act,'[2] he does not speak; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Second

[1] *vaggena*, by a section only of the Order, not all the members being present. *Cf. Vin.* i. 108, 111; also below, p. 269, and *Vin.* iv. 126.

[2] *na kammârahā*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 126, 152, 153; v. 221.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XIII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, assigned lodgings to the Order and distributed meals.[1] Now at that time monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka were newly ordained as well as of little merit; [37] they obtained whatever inferior lodgings belonged to the Order and inferior meals.[2] These made monks look down upon[3] the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, saying:

"Dabba, the Mallian, assigns lodgings through favouritism[4] and distributes meals through favouritism."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka make monks look down upon the venerable Dabba, the Mallian?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, made monks look down upon Dabba, the Mallian?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them saying:

"How can you, foolish men, make monks look down upon Dabba, the Mallian? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In making (someone) look down upon,[5] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 158 (=*B.D.* i. 272 ff.) and *Vin.* iv. 154.

[2] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 160=*B.D.* i. 275.

[3] *ujjhāpenti. VA.* 770 says *avajānāpenti avaññāya olokāpenti lāmakato vā cintāpentī ti attho; cf.* above, p. 2, n. 3, on *ujjhāyanti.*

[4] *chandāya=pakkhapātena, VA.* 771.

[5] *ujjhāpanake;* in full probably meaning "in making a monk look down upon another monk," see *Old Comy.* below.

Now at that time monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka thought: "Making (someone) look down upon is forbidden by the lord, (but) this much shall the monks hear," and in the neighbourhood of monks, they criticised[1] the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, saying: "Dabba, the Mallian, assigns lodgings through favouritism and distributes meals through favouritism." Those who were modest monks . . . (as in ‖ **1** ‖; *instead of* "make monks look down upon" *read* "criticise") . . . ". . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In making (someone) look down upon, in criticising,[2] there is an offence of expiation." ‖ **2** ‖

Making (*someone*) *look down upon* means: if he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame[3] to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings or as distributor of meals or as apportioner of conjey or as apportioner of fruit or as apportioner of solid foods or as disposer of trifles,[4] there is an offence of expiation. ‖ 1 ‖

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down

---

[1] *khīyanti. Khīyati*, Skrt. *ksiyate* is explained in the Dictionaries to mean "to be exhausted, to waste away, to become dejected, to fall away from" (*P.E.D.*); "geht zu Ende" (Geiger, *Pali Lit.*, p. 115); "to wane, to decrease, to be diminished, to waste away, perish" (Monier-Williams). But *VA*. 296, 771 gives *pakāsenti*, to show up, illustrate, explain, make known, give information about (*P.E.D.*). *Cf.* above, p. 2, n. 4.

[2] *khīyanake—i.e.*, the action of a person. *P.E.D.* calls this "a falling-away offence (legal term denoting the falling away from a consent once given)," as in Pāc. 79, 81 (*khīyadhamma*); also see *Vin*. ii. 94, 100, *A*. iii. 269, iv. 374.

[3] *maṅku*, lit. staggering, so shock, confusion, shame; see *A*. V. v. This trio also occurs below, p. 280.

[4] *Cf. Vin*. iv. 155. At *Vin*. ii. 176 f. the qualifications that a monk appointed "distributor," etc., should possess, are given. The items that the last, *appamattakavissajjaka*, is to dispose of, are enumerated at *Vin*. ii. 177. *Cf.* also *A*. iii. 275.

upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained or one who is not ordained, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings . . . as disposer of trifles [**38**] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained or one who is not ordained, desiring to blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is not ordained, (but) agreed upon or not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings . . . or as disposer of trifles, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.[1] || 2 ||

There is no offence if he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one acting by nature from desire, from hatred, from stupidity, from fear[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[3] || 3 || **3** ||

The Third

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 302, 307, 313, 327; above, p. 233, and *Vin.* iv. 155.

[2] These are the four *agatis*. Only a monk not endowed with them can be appointed a distributor of the various items mentioned here and in other parts of *Vin.* See *Vin.* ii. 176 f.; also *cf.* the "silver-remover," above, p. 104, the assigner of bowls, above, p. 122, and *Vin.* iii. 183, 185; see *B.D.* i. 323, n. 7, for further references.

[3] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 155.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, monks preparing lodgings[1] in winter-time in the open air, drying their bodies in the sun, when the time was announced,[2] setting forth neither removed[3] them nor had them removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission).[4] The lodgings became damp.[5] Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can monks, preparing lodgings in the open air, setting forth, neither remove them nor have them removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission, so that) the lodgings are (left) damp?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . .

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks preparing lodgings in the open air . . . (left) damp? . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, spreading[6] or having spread in the

---

[1] A definition of *senâsana* given at *Vbh.* 251 is a catalogue of things to sit and lie on, various types of buildings, caves, etc. It does not include *seyyā*, obviously thought of as a *senâsana*, below, p. 244. *VbhA.* 365 merely says that if he sleeps and sits there, it is a "lodging."

[2] *VA.* 770 says, "for the gruel meal."

[3] *uddharati.* Same word as *ubbhata* (+*kaṭhina*) of Nissag. I-III.

[4] *anāpucchā.* *Cf.* *āpucchā* and *anā°* at *Vin.* iv. 100, 101, 165, 166. *Cf.* also *Vin.* ii. 211, where monks set out without asking permission as to the lodgings. It is there said, and *cf.* *Old Comy.* below, that a monk, or, failing him, a probationer, or, failing him, a monastery-attendant should be asked for permission; this is in order that such a person may take care of the lodgings during the monks' absence.

[5] *ovaṭṭham hoti.* *VA.* 770 says that what remained became damp owing to the snow and rain. *Ovaṭṭha* occurs above, p. 224, in connection with heaps of clay and soil.

[6] *santharitvā.* *Cf.* above, p. 72, n. 1, but not used in that sense here.

open air a couch or a chair or a mattress or a stool[1] belonging to the Order, setting forth, should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

Now at that time monks, staying in the open air, were bringing back[2] lodgings early in the morning. Now the lord saw these monks bringing back lodgings early in the morning, and seeing them, in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, for the eight months (of the time) not appointed for keeping the rains[3] [39] to put aside lodgings in a hut[4] or at the foot of a tree, wherever crows or vultures do not leave droppings."[5] || 2 || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.[6]

---

[1] *koccha.* See *Old Comy.* below. *Vin. Texts* i. 34, n., says, "it is apparently therefore of wicker work." Called at *Vin. Texts* iii. 165 (= *Vin.* ii. 149) "a cane-bottomed chair." Allowed at *Vin.* ii. 149.

[2] *atiharanti*, or removing from one place to another.

[3] *avassika-saṃkete.* At *Vin.* i. 298 *vassika-saṃkete* is one of the five occasions when a monk may lay aside his outer cloak. *Saṃketa* at *B.D.* i. was rendered "rendezvous"—*i.e.*, an appointment, an appointed time. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 234, n., on this word. At *Vin.* i. 107 it is an offence of wrong-doing to recite the Pātimokkha in cell after cell without making a rendezvous or appointment (*asaṃketena*), since incoming monks did not know where the *uposatha* was to be held. *VA.* 772 says that the four months of the cold and the four months of the hot seasons are the eight months not thus appointed (*evaṃ apaññatte*) as months of the rains.

[4] *maṇḍape.* *VA.* 772 says, "a *maṇḍapa* (shed or hut) of *sākhā* (branches), or a *maṇḍapa* of *padara* (boards, planks of wood; or this might be a *maṇḍapa* in a crevice).

[5] N.B.—This is not a *sikkhāpada*, rule, but an *anujānāmi*, "allowance."

[6] *Cf.* above, p. 161.

Couch means:[1] there are four (kinds of) couch: a long one,[2] one with slats,[3] one with curved legs,[4] one with removable legs.[5]

Chair means: there are four (kinds of) chair: a long one, one with slats, one with curved legs, one with removable legs.[6]

Mattress means: there are five (kinds of) mattress: a mattress (made) of wool, a mattress (made) of cotton-cloth, a mattress (made) of bark, a mattress (made) of *tiṇa*-grass, a mattress (made) of leaves.[7]

Stool means: made of bark or made of khus-khus[8] or made of *muñja*-grass or made of reeds[9]; it is bound, having tucked them in.[10]

Spreading means: himself spreading.

---

[1] This definition of *mañca* occurs at *Vin.* iv. 168, 169; *VbhA.* 365. These four kinds of couches and four kinds of chairs are allowed at *Vin.* ii. 149.

[2] *masāraka.* *VA.* 773 says, "it is made by boring a hole into the feet of the couch, and putting a knotched end through there."

[3] *bundikābaddha.* *VA.* 773 says, "it is made by holding the bedstead together, having burnt the feet of the couch with knotched ends."

[4] *kuḷīrapādaka*, or carved. *VA.* 773, "made with feet like the feet of horses, rams, etc. Whatever has curved feet (*vaṅkapādako*, lit. curved as to the feet) is called *kuḷīrapādaka*" (lit. a crab-footer).

[5] *āhaccapādaka.* *VA.* 774 says that "it is made by piercing the leg (*aṅge*). Then having pierced the knotched end, putting a knot through there, and giving a pin (or peg, *āṇiṃ*) above, the couch that is made should be called an *āhaccapādaka*." This probably means that the pin can be removed at pleasure, when the couch would collapse. At *Vin.* iv. 46 it is defined as *aṅge vijjhitvā ṭhito hoti*, standing, having pierced the leg—*i.e.*, having put the pin through. *Āhacca-pādaka* means lit. a "take-away footer"—*i.e.*, one whose feet can be taken away.

[6] =*Vin.* iv. 168, 169, *VbhA.* 365.

[7] Same definition given at *VbhA.* 365. These five kinds of *bhisi* are allowed at *Vin.* ii. 150. *Cf.* above, p. 47, n. 1, on *bhisi*.

[8] *usīra*, one of the plants "propagated from roots," *cf.* above, p. 228.

[9] *babbaja*, or bulrushes. Shoes made of this and of *muñja*-grass were not to be worn, *Vin.* i. 190.

[10] *anto saṃveṭhetvā baddhaṃ hoti.* *VA.* 774 says that it is bound in the middle and spread out above and below. The middle, being made of the hides of lions and tigers, gives the *senâsana* the appearance of being made of gold.

Having spread[1] means: making another spread. If he makes one who is not ordained spread (it), it is an impediment[2] for him.[3] If he makes one who is ordained spread it, there is an impediment for the one who spreads (it).[4]

Setting forth, should neither remove it means: should not himself remove it.

Nor have it removed means: should not make another remove it.

Or should go away without asking (for permission) means: not asking a monk or a novice or a monastery attendant (for permission),[5] if he goes further than the outward stone-throw of a man of average height,[6] there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order[7] when it belongs to the Order, spreading it or having it spread in the open, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order . . . there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, spreading it or . . . in the open air . . . without having asked (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If it is a carpet[8] or a bed-cover[9] or a ground-

---

[1] Causative.

[2] *palibodha*, or obstacle, obstruction. *Cf. Vin. Texts* ii. 157, n. 2.

[3] *VA*. 774, for the one who causes it to be spread out.

[4] *santhāraka*, at *Vin*. ii. 113, 116, 148, meaning a (*tiṇa*-grass) mat. Here it must refer to the person spreading out the things.

[5] *Cf. Vin*. ii. 211.

[6] *Cf. B.D.* i. 74=*Vin*. iii. 46.

[7] *Cf.* Pāc. XV, XVI.

[8] *cimilikā*. At *Vin*. ii. 150 monks are allowed to use *cola*, cotton-cloth, as a *cilimikā*. Ed. *Vin. Texts* iii. 167, n. 2, says, *cilimikā* may be a "rug. . . . It is probably the same word as, or connected with, *cimilikā*." See same note for Bu.'s definition of this word. Here he says, *VA*. 775, when the earth is prepared with plaster it is made for preserving its texture, spreading it below, they spread out a *kaṭasāraka* (a mat for sitting on or lying on) above.

[9] *uttarattharaṇa*, see above, p. 46, n. 3.

covering[1] or a straw-mat[2] or an animal's skin[3] or a mat for the feet[4] or a wooden chair,[5] spreading it or having it spread in the open air, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without having asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, having removed it, he goes away; if, having caused it to be removed, he goes away; if, having asked (for permission), he goes away; if, drying himself in the sun, he goes away[6]; if it comes to be taken possession of by something[7]; if there are accidents[8]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Fourth [**40**]

---

[1] *bhummattharaṇa*, see above, p. 46, n. 4.

[2] *taṭṭikā*. *VA*. 776 says, "made of palm-leaves or of bark." *Cf*. *Jā*. i. 141, *Vism*. 97.

[3] *cammakhaṇḍa*. At *Vin*. ii. 122 this was allowed as a water vessel (*vāraka*). Above it means a skin used as a mat, as at *Miln*. 366 and *Vism*. 99 (translated *P. Purity*, p. 115, "piece of leather").

[4] *pādapuñchanī*. At *Vin*. ii. 174 monks are allowed to use a bear-skin, a piece of drapery (*cakkali*), and a little piece of cloth as a *pādapuñchanī*. This, according to *Vin. Texts* iii. 218, is a mat to wipe the feet on, not to sit upon. *VA*. 776 says that it is made of rope and rags for wiping the feet on.

[5] *phalaka-pīṭha*, a chair (made) of a board, plank or slips of wood. Also called at *VA*. 776 *dārumayapīṭha*, a chair made of wood.

[6] *otāpento gacchati*. *VA*. 776 says there is no offence if, drying himself in the heat of the sun, he thinks, 'Coming back I will remove it.'

[7] *kenaci palibuddhaṃ hoti*. *VA*. 776 says that if a senior monk, turning (the owner) out (*uṭṭhāpetvā*), takes it, if a yakkha or a departed one, coming along, sits on it, or if some *ṛsi*, coming along, takes it, or if lions and tigers stand on it, the lodging becomes taken possession of.

[8] *āpadāsu*—*i.e.*, *VA*. 777 says there is no offence if there are accidents (*antarāya*) to those leading the brahma-life for their life-time. *Cf*. Pāc. XV, XVI.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XV

. . . at Sāvatthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks were companions. Staying, they just stayed together, setting forth, they just set forth together. These, spreading[1] a sleeping-place in a certain dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, neither removed it nor had it removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission). The lodging became eaten by white ants. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of seventeen monks, spreading a sleeping-place in a dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, neither remove it nor have it removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission, so that) the lodging is eaten by white ants?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . . He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of seventeen monks . . . belonging to the Order, setting forth neither removed it . . . eaten by white ants?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men . . . eaten by white ants? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread in a dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

---

[1] *santharitvā*, see Intr., p. xxii.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.[1]

Sleeping-place[2] means: a mattress,[3] a carpet,[4] a bed-cover, a ground-covering, a straw mat, an animal's skin,[4] a piece of cloth for sitting on,[5] a sheet,[6] a grass-mat,[7] a leaf mat.

Spreading means: himself spreading.[8]

Having spread means: making another spread.[8]

Setting forth, should neither remove it means: should not himself remove it.[8]

Nor have it removed means: should not make another remove it.[8]

Or should go away without asking (for permission) means: not asking a monk or a novice or [**41**] a monastery-attendant (for permission), if he goes further than the fence of a fenced-in monastery, there is an offence of expiation; if he goes further than the precincts[9] of a monastery not fenced-in, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order[10] when it belongs to the Order, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission) there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order . . . without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 161, 239.

[2] Another definition of *seyyā* given above, p. 196.

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 471.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 241, for this and the next four words.

[5] *nisīdana.* Defined at *Vin.* iii. 232, iv. 123, 171.

[6] *paccattharaṇa.* Bu. at *VA.* 777 calls it *pāvāro kojavo,* a cloak (mantle ?), a rug or cover with long hair.

[7] *tiṇa-santhāra.* *VA.* 777 says a mat of any grasses whatsoever; the same for a leaf-mat.

[8] *Cf.* above, p. 241.

[9] *upacāra.*

[10] *Cf.* Pāc. XIV, XVI.

when it belongs to the Order, spreading a sleeping-place . . . or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread in the precincts of a dwelling-place[1] or in an assembly-room[2] or in a hut[3] or at the foot of a tree,[4] setting forth should neither remove it . . . or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If, spreading a couch or a chair or having it spread in a monastery or in the precincts of a monastery or in an assembly-room[5] or in a hut[6] or at the foot of a tree, setting forth should neither remove it . . . or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing.[7] If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, having removed it, he goes away; if, having caused it to be removed, he goes away; if, having asked (for permission), he goes away; if it comes to be taken possession of by something; if going with the expectation,[8] standing there, he asks (for per-

---

[1] *VA.* 778 says that this means a cell, *pariveṇa.*

[2] *upaṭṭhānasālā.* *Cf.* above, p. 194, n. 4. *VA.* 778 calls this *pariveṇabhojanasālā*, a refectory and cells.

[3] *maṇḍapa.* *Cf.* above, p. 239, n. 4. *VA.* 778 says *pariveṇamaṇḍapo.*

[4] *VA.* 778 says *pariveṇarukkhamūla.*

[5] *VA.* 778 here merely says *bhojanasālā*, refectory.

[6] *VA.* 778 here says that it is *maṇḍapa,* whether covered or not, for the assembly of many people.

[7] Apparently not a pācittiya as there is not so much danger of the things being eaten by white ants if spread in these places, *VA.* 778.

[8] *sâpekkho.*

mission); if he becomes taken possession of by something[1]; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || 3 || 2 ||

The Fifth

[1] *VA*. 780, by full rivers, robber chiefs, and is unable to return.
[2] *Cf*. Pāc. XIV. 2, 3.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XVI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks took possession of the best sleeping-places.[1] The monks who were elders turned them away. Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"What now if we, by some stratagem, should spend the rainy season[2] in this very place?" Then the group of six monks, encroaching upon[3] (the space intended for) monks who were elders, lay down in the sleeping-places, saying:

"He for whom it becomes too crowded may depart." Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying.

"How can the group of six monks lie down in sleeping-places, encroaching upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. [**42**] . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, lay down in sleeping-places . . . for monks who are elders?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, lie down in sleeping-places, encroaching upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing

---

[1] *varaseyyāyo palibuddhanti*=*Vin.* ii. 166. For *palibuddha*, *cf.* above, pp. 242, 245 *f.* [2] *Cf.* above, p. 208.

[3] *anupakhajja*=*anupavisitvā* according to *Old Comy.* and *VA.* 780. Word occurs again in Pāc. XLIII and at *Vin.* ii. 213. Ed. *Vin. Texts* iii. 285, n. 3, says that sense intended in these three passages is the same, while it is different at *Vin.* ii. 88, there explained by Bu. as *antopavisati.* At *Vin.* i. 47 the monk who shares the cell of his preceptor is not to sit down so as to encroach upon the elders (*na there bhikkhū anupakhajja nisīditabbaṃ*).

those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place in a dwelling belonging to the Order, knowing that he is encroaching upon (the space intended for) a monk arrived first, saying, 'He for whom it becomes too crowded may depart,' doing it for just this object, not for another,[1] there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . .

A dwelling belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.[2]

He knows[3] means: he knows, thinking, 'He is an old man'[4]; he knows, thinking, 'He is an ill man'; he knows, thinking, 'It was given to the Order.'

Encroaching upon means: forcing a way into.[5]

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if entering or departing he spreads a sleeping-place or has one spread in the precincts of a couch or a chair, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

Doing it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever for which to lie down, encroaching, in a sleeping-place. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If entering or departing, setting aside the precincts of a couch or chair, he spreads a sleeping-

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 352, and *Vin.* iv. 149, 150.
[2] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 266, and above, p. 244.
[3] *Cf.* above, p. 161.
[4] *vuḍḍho ;* therefore he should not be made to get up, *VA.* 780.
[5] *anupavisitvā*, or entering into=*Vin.* iv. 95. *Cf. VA.* 780.

place or causes one to be spread, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he spreads a sleeping-place or causes one to be spread in the precincts of a dwelling-place or in an assembly-room or in a hut or at the foot of a tree or in the open air,[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.[2] || 2 ||

There is no offence if an ill man enters, if one pressed by cold or by heat enters, if there are accidents[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Sixth [**43**]

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 241. [2] *Cf.* Pāc. XIV, XV.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XVII

. . . at Sāvatthī[1] in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of seventeen monks were repairing a large dwelling-place in the neighbourhood,[2] thinking: " We will spend the rains here."

The group of six monks saw the group of seventeen monks as they were repairing the dwelling-place, and seeing them, they said:

" Your reverences, this group of seventeen monks are repairing a dwelling-place. Come, we will turn them away."

Some spoke thus: " Wait, your reverences, until they have repaired it; when it is repaired, we will turn them away."

Then the group of six monks said to the group of seventeen monks: " Go away,[3] your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to[4] us."

" Your reverences, should not this have been explained before, and we would have repaired another ?"

" Your reverences, does not the dwelling-place belong to the Order ?"

" Yes, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to the Order."

" Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to us."

" Your reverences, the dwelling-place is big[5]; you stay, and we too will stay."

---

[1] This story also forms introductory story to Cūḷavagga VI. 11= *Vin*. ii. 166.

[2] *paccantima*, adjoining, bordering, next to.

[3] *uṭṭheta*, or get up.

[4] *pāpuṇāti*.

[5] *mahallaka*, said of a vihāra at *Vin*. iii. 156 (=*B.D*. i. 267). A big building containing several rooms to accommodate a number of people (*Ṭīkā*); implies a permanent building.

"Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to us," and angry, displeased, taking them by the throat they threw them out. These being thrown out, wept. Monks said (to them):

"Why do you, your reverences, weep?"

"Your reverences, this group of six monks, angry, displeased threw us out of a dwelling-place belonging to the Order."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, angry, displeased, throw out monks from a dwelling-place belonging to the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . .

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you, angry and displeased . . . to the Order?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, angry . . . belonging to the Order? Foolish men, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, angry, displeased, should throw out a monk or cause him to be thrown out from a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case. [**44**]

Monk[1] means: another monk.

Angry, displeased[2] means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.

A dwelling-place belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.[3]

Should throw out means: if, taking (him) in the room[4] he throws him out on to the verandah,[5] there is an

[1] Acc.

[2] *Cf. B.D.* i. 281 = *Vin.* iii. 163.

[3] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 266, iv. 41, 43.

[4] *gabbhe.*

[5] *pamukhaṃ*, house-front.

offence of expiation. If, taking him on the verandah, he throws him outside,[1] there is an offence of expiation. If, with one effort[2] he makes him pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause him to be thrown out means: if he commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When once commanded, if he makes him pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order[3] when it belongs to the Order, (and) angry, displeased, throws him out or causes him to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order, (and) angry . . . causes him to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, (and) angry . . . to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws (a monk) out or causes (him) to be thrown out from the precincts of a dwelling-place or from an assembly-room or from a hut or from the foot of a tree or from the open air, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes one who is not ordained to be thrown out from a dwelling-place or from the precincts of a dwelling-place . . . or from the open air, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is doubtful as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual, (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-

[1] *I.e.*, out of the compound.

[2] *payoga*, or action, thrust.

[3] *Cf.* Pāc. XIV-XVI.

doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he throws out or causes one who is not scrupulous to be thrown out, if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out one who is mad, if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out one who makes strife, one who makes quarrels, one who makes contention, one who makes brawls, one who makes disputes in the Order,[1] if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out a novice or one who shares a cell or one who is not proceeding fitly,[2] if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Seventh

[1] These same words said of the nun Caṇḍakālī at *Vin.* iv. 230. See also *Vin.* i. 328; and *A.* iii. 252, where five dangers to be expected for such a monk are enumerated.

[2] *na sammāvattanta.*

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that [45] time two monks (were) in a lofty cell with an upper part,[1] in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order; one lived below, one above. The monk above sat down suddenly on a couch with removable feet.[2] The foot of the couch, falling off,[3] hit[4] the lower monk on the head, (and) this monk uttered a cry of distress. Monks, running up, said to this monk:

"Why do you, your reverence, utter a cry of distress?"

Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, sit down suddenly on a couch with removable feet?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, sat down suddenly on a couch with removable feet?" . . .

---

[1] *upari-vehāsa-kuṭī*. Meaning is obscure. For *vehāsa* as "above ground," see *B.D.* i. 79. *Vehāsa-kuṭī* seems to be a lofty cell, as *Old Comy.* says it is one which will not knock the head of a man of medium height. *P.E.D.* gives "air-hut, airy room." Probably means the cell was so high that there was room for an "upper berth" (see Dickson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1876, 128, n. 1), not a single-roomed cell. *VA.* 782 says *uparivehāsakuṭī* is a two or three storeyed cell without a roof (*acchannatala*).

[2] *āhaccapādaka*, see above, p. 240, in definition of "couch" and "chair." *Āhaccapādaka mañca* allowed at *Vin.* ii. 149.

[3] *nippaṭṭivā*=*nipatitvā*, *nikkhamitvā*, *VA.* 782.

[4] *avatthāsi*. *Cf.* *B.D.* i. 138, 140=*Vin.* iii. 79, 81.

". . . It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, should sit down[1] or lie down on a couch or chair with removable feet, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Dwelling-place belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.[2]

Lofty cell means: it does not touch the head[3] of a man of medium height.

Couch with removable feet means: having perforated[4] the legs, it stands.

Chair with removable feet means: having perforated the legs, it stands.

Should sit down on means: if he sits down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

Should lie down on means: if he lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to the Order, (and) sits down on or lies down on a couch or a chair with removable feet in a lofty cell with an upper part, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order . . . If he thinks that it belongs to an individual

---

[1] Note that *sahasā*, suddenly, hastily, is omitted in the Rule; it is put in at *Vin. Texts* i. 34. *Cf.* this for translation of *uparivehāsakuṭī*; also Gogerly's version, *J.R.A.S.*, 1862, 443, and Dickson's, *J.R.A.S.*, 1876, 111. The latter also puts *sahasā* ("hurriedly") into the Rule, and it would seem more logical to do so; for if no couch or chair with removable legs were to be sat or lain on in an upper storey, there was little point in allowing these objects there at all.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 161, 239, 244, 248, 251.

[3] *asīsaghaṭṭā*. *VA*. 782, none of the lower beams or rafters touch (or knock) the head of a man of medium (middle or average, *majjhima*) measure.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 240, and *VA*. 774.

when it belongs to the Order . . . with an upper part, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he is in a cell that is not lofty[1]; if he is in one that touches the head; if the one below comes to be not in use; if there comes to be an accumulation of boards[2]; if a pin is provided[3]; if standing on it he takes down from or hangs up on[4]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Eighth [**46**]

---

[1] *avehāsakuṭiyā.* *VA.* 782, made among sāl-leaves on the ground, for it is not possible to hurt another person there.

[2] *padara-sañcitaṃ hoti.* *VA.* 783 (the cell) of which the uppermost floor (*tala*) is spread over thickly with sticks and planks.

[3] *paṭāṇi dinnā hoti.* This means the pin or peg which must be inserted in a couch or chair whose feet are removable in order that the foot will not fall off when the chair is sat upon; *VA.* 783, and *cf.* *VA.* 774.

[4] *VA.* 783, "standing on a couch or chair whose feet are removable, he says, 'take down a robe or anything hung up on a peg (*nāgadanta*)' or hangs up another, there is no offence for him."

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XIX

. . . at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time a chief minister, the venerable Channa's supporter, was having a dwelling-place built for the venerable Channa.[1] Then the venerable Channa again and again had the finished dwelling-place roofed, again and again had it plastered. The overloaded dwelling-place fell down. Then the venerable Channa, collecting grass and sticks, despoiled the cornfield of a certain brahmin. Then that brahmin looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered ones despoil our cornfields?" Monks heard this brahmin who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Channa again and again have a finished dwelling-place roofed, again and again have it plastered (so that) the overloaded dwelling-place falls down?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, again and again had a finished dwelling-place roofed . . . so that the overloaded dwelling-place fell down?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, again and again have a finished dwelling-place roofed, again and again have it plastered, (so that) the overloaded dwelling-place falls down? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When a large dwelling-place is being built for a monk,

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 266, where a householder was building a dwelling-place for him.

an enclosure[1] of two or three roofings may be determined upon for placing the door-bolts, for making the window-holes[2] as far as the door-way,[3] in establishing it where there are no crops.[4] If, though established where there are no crops, he should determine upon (something) more than that, there is an offence of expiation."[5] ‖ 1 ‖

Large means: it is so called if it is a dwelling-place having a benefactor.[6]

Dwelling-place means: it comes to be smeared inside or smeared outside or smeared inside and outside.[6]

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.[7]

As far as the door-way[8] means: a reach of the hand from all round the door-posts and lintel.[9]

For placing the door-bolts means: for placing the door-way.

For making the window-holes means: for making

---

[1] *pariyāya*. *VA*. 784 says *pariyāyaṃ vuccati parikkhepo*. *Parikkhepo* is closing round, surrounding, enclosure. *Pariyāya* can also mean method. [2] *ālokasandhi*, small holes for light and air.

[3] *dvārakosa*. *Dvāra* is " the aperture and not that by which the aperture could be closed." This is called *kavāṭa*. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 160, n. 3. *Kosa* is a cavity or enclosure containing something.

[4] *appaharita*, " little or no grass " (*C.P.D.*), but *Old Comy*. points to " crops."

[5] My translation of this rule differs considerably from that given at *Vin. Texts* i. 35, where ed. says, " This rule . . . is somewhat obscure, owing to our want of information as to the mode in which such dwellings should be put up." *Vin. Texts* i. 35 has " rectified " for *adhiṭṭhātabbaṃ*, which I have translated as " determined upon." For the point of this rule is that when the vihāra is built and everything is *ṭhito*, fixed, established, a monk must not ask the *dāyaka*, benefactor, donor, to change the positions of doors and windows or make any additions or rectifications. If he does so, he incurs a pācittiya offence. [6] *Cf. Vin*. iii. 156 (=*B.D*. i. 267, 268).

[7] *Cf. Vin*. iii. 226, 232.

[8] *VA*. 783 says that here *dvārakosa* means a space (*okāsa*) the measure of the door's breadth from all round the door-posts and lintel; it quotes other authorities giving different measures. Apparently doors and windows must not be made nearer than this distance to the doorway.

[9] *piṭṭhasaṃghāṭa*. Allowed at *Vin*. ii. 120, 148. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 105, n. 2.

windows[1]: whitewash,[2] black colouring, the use of red chalk,[3] wreath-work,[4] creeper-work, sword-fish design,[5] cupboards.[6] [47]

An enclosure of two or three roofings should be determined upon, in establishing it where there are no crops means: *crops* mean: grain and pulses.[7] If it is established where there are crops (and) he determines upon (some alteration), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is roofing with a way, having determined upon two ways, commanding a third way, he may depart.[8] If he is roofing with an enclosure, having determined upon two enclosures, commanding a third enclosure, he may depart.

If, though established where there are no crops, he should determine upon (something) more than that[9] means: if he is roofing with tiles, for every tile there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with stones, for every stone there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with plaster, for every lump there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with grass, for every wisp there is an

---

[1] *vātapāna.* Three kinds allowed at *Vin.* ii. 148, but not the kinds given above. *VA.* 784 takes it as *vātapānakavāṭa*, shutters, which perhaps makes more sense here.

[2] All these items are allowed, in other connections, at *Vin.* ii. 121, also at *Vin.* ii. 117 with two more not occurring above. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 172. " Whitewash " is *setavaṇṇa*, or plaster; " black colouring " is *kāḷavaṇṇa*, or blacking.

[3] *gerukaparikamma*, red colouring. These three colourings are allowed to be used in vihāras at *Vin.* ii. 150.

[4] These four kinds of design are allowed in another connection at *Vin.* ii. 152.

[5] *makaradantaka.* The meaning is not at all clear, but " a design in painting or carving " (*P.E.D.*).

[6] *pañcapaṭṭhika.* For lack of better translation, I follow *Vin. Texts* iii. 97, *q.v.* n. 3. But the meaning is very doubtful.

[7] See *B.D.* i. 83, n. 4.

[8] *VA.* 785, having had it roofed in two ways, *magga*, but because it was badly done he may have it roofed again in a third way—doubtless he may choose three of the five ways mentioned immediately below.

[9] *VA.* 785 says, " upon a fourth way or enclosure over and above the three ways and enclosures."

offence of expiation. If he is roofing with leaves, for every leaf there is an offence of expiation.[1] || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than two or three enclosures (and) determines upon,[2] there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than two or three enclosures (and) determines upon, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than two or three enclosures (and) determines upon, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than two or three enclosures, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than two or three enclosures, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than two or three enclosures, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if there are two or three enclosures; if there are less than two or three enclosures; if it is in a cave, if it is in a hut, if it is in a *tiṇa*-grass hut; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property[3]; except it be as a house there is no offence in any other circumstances; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 3 || **2** ||

The Ninth

[1] These five kinds of roofing are allowed at *Vin.* ii. 154. It is meant here that once the building is finished he must not add one tile or stone and so forth.

[2] Presumably more roofings or enclosures.

[3] I was told in Ceylon that this means that a monk gives something—rice, paddy, fruit—to a family, which then uses it in preparing a meal for him.

[4] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 155, and *B.D.* i. 264, notes.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XX

. . . at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of Āḷavī, doing repairs, knowing that the water contained life, sprinkled grass and clay and had them sprinkled. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the monks of Āḷavī, knowing that the water contained life . . . and have them sprinkled ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowing that the water contained life . . . and had them sprinkled ?"

" It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

" How can you, foolish men, knowing that the water contained life . . . and have them sprinkled ? [**48**] It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, knowing that the water contains life, should sprinkle grass or clay or should have them sprinkled, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

He knows[1] means: either he knows by himself or others tell him.

Should sprinkle means: if he himself sprinkles, there is an offence of expiation.

Should have sprinkled means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he sprinkles many times, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

---

[1] *Cf.* pp. 161, 297.

If he thinks that it contains life when it contains life, (and) sprinkles grass or clay or has them sprinkled, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it contains life . . . has them sprinkled, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it does not contain life when it contains life . . . has them sprinkled, there is no offence.[1] If he thinks that it contains life when it does not contain life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it does not contain life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it does not contain life when it does not contain life, there is no offence. ||2||

There is no offence if it was unintentional, if he was not thinking, if he did not know[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. ||3||**2**||

The Tenth

This is its key:

Vegetable-growth, by another, making (someone) look down upon, these two on setting forth,
First, throwing out, removable (feet), and on doors, containing life.

The Second Division: that on Vegetable-growth

[1] Oldenberg says, *Vin.* iv. 358, that in his MS. called C. this case is left out.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 225, 229, and *Vin.* iv. 125.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive[1] requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick.[2] Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"Your reverences, at present monks who are elders, exhorting nuns, come to receive requisites . . . for the sick. Come, your reverences, let us too exhort nuns."

Then the group of six monks, approaching nuns, spoke thus:

"Now, [49] approach us, sisters, then we will exhort (you)."

Then those nuns approached the group of six monks, and having approached and greeted the group of six monks, they sat down at a respectful distance. Then the group of six monks, giving the nuns merely inferior talk on dhamma, spending the day in worldly talk,[3] dismissed them, saying: "Go, sisters."

Then these nuns approached the lord, and having approached and greeted the lord, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to these nuns:

"I hope, nuns, that the exhortation was effective?"[4]

"Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? The masters, the group of six monks, giving merely inferior talk . . . dismissed us, saying, 'Go, sisters.'"

Then the lord gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted these nuns with talk on dhamma. Then these nuns, gladdened . . . delighted by the lord with talk on

---

[1] *lābhino honti*, lit. came to be receivers of. [2] =p. 279.

[3] *tiracchānakathā*. Various species of this, talk of kings, robbers, and so on, given at *Vin.* iv. 164; *D.* i. 7, 179; *M.* i. 513; *S.* v. 419; *A.* v. 128, etc. [4] *iddha*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 313.

dhamma, greeting the lord, departed, keeping their right sides towards him. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the group of six monks, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, giving nuns merely inferior talk . . . 'Go, sisters'?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, giving nuns merely inferior talk on dhamma . . . dismiss them, saying: 'Go, sisters'? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ." And having rebuked them, and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow (you) to agree upon[1] an exhorter of nuns. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, a monk should be requested, and having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order agree upon the monk so and so as exhorter of nuns. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as exhorter of nuns. If it pleases the venerable ones, let the monk so and so be agreed upon as exhorter of nuns . . . they should speak. And a second time I tell this matter . . . And a third time I tell this matter. Let the Order listen to me . . . they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, and it is right . . . Thus do I understand this.'"

Then the lord, having rebuked the group of six monks in many a figure [**50**] for their weakness . . . ". . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, not agreed upon, should exhort nuns, there is an offence of expiation."

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 14, 81, 157 for other "agreements," *sammuti*.

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time monks who were elders, (and who had been) agreed upon, exhorting nuns, came to receive, as before,[1] requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick. Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

" Your reverences, at present, the monks who are elders, (and who have been) agreed upon, exhorting nuns, are receiving, as before,[1] requisites . . . for the sick. Come, your reverences, let us, going outside the boundary,[2] agreeing upon one another as exhorter of nuns, exhort the nuns."

Then the group of six monks, going outside the boundary, agreeing upon one another as exhorter of nuns, approaching the nuns, said:

" Now we, sisters, are agreed upon, so approach us and we will exhort (you)."

Then these nuns . . . (*etc., as above* || 1 ||) . . . having rebuked them, and given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

" I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with eight qualities as exhorter of nuns: one who is virtuous,[3] who lives restrained by the restraint of the Pātimokkha,[4] who is possessed of good behaviour and lawful resort,[5] who sees danger in the slightest faults,[4] who undertaking, trains himself in the rules of training,[4] who has become very learned, who knows the learning

---

[1] *tath' eva.*

[2] Of their particular *āvāsa,* doubtless with the idea of setting up as a *saṁgha* on their own and carrying out their own formal acts.

[3] =*Vin.* ii. 95 to " linguistic form " below; and =*A.* ii. 22-23 to " vision " below.

[4] *Cf. D.* i. 63=*A.* ii. 14=iv. 140=*M.* i. 33=*It.* 118=*Vism.* i. 15=*Vbh.* 244.

[5] References as in n. 4 above. Translation of *ācāragocarasampanna* as at *P. Purity* i. 20. *VA.* 788 says families possessed of faith are *gocara,* " lawful resort."

by heart,[1] who is a store of learning.[2] Those things which, lovely at the beginning, lovely at the middle, lovely at the ending, declare with the spirit, with the letter[3] the Brahma-life completely fulfilled, wholly purified—such things[4] come to be much learned by him, learnt by heart,[5] repeated out loud, carefully pondered over, well penetrated by vision[6]; both the Pātimokkhas come to be properly handed down[7] to him in detail, well sectioned, well regulated, well investigated rule by rule,[8] as to the linguistic form.[9] He comes to be of charming speech, of charming delivery[10]; as a rule he becomes dear to nuns, liked (by them), he becomes competent to exhort nuns, he does not come to be one who, on going forth for the sake of the lord, on being clad in the yellow robes, has previously committed (some offence) against an important rule[11]; he comes to be one of twenty years' standing[12] or of

[1] *suta-dhara*, lit. " a bearer of the heard," all teaching being at that time oral.

[2] *suta-sannicaya*.

[3] See *Vin. Texts* iii. 50, n. 2.

[4] *dhammā*.

[5] *dhātā*. At *Vin.* ii. 95, *VA*. 788 *dhatā*.

[6] *diṭṭhiyā=paññāya*, *VA*. 788.

[7] *svāgatāni=suṭṭhu āgatāni*, *VA*. 790. See also *A*. iv. 140, *G.S.* iv. 95, translated: " properly handed down," and *Vin. Texts* iii. 51, " completely handed down." Passage also occurs *Vin.* i. 65, where it is the fifth of the five necessary qualities in a monk who is to ordain a nun. At *Vin.* i. 68 a sixth quality is added. See also *Vin.* ii. 249.

[8] *suttaso* or *suttato*. See *Vin. Texts* i. xxix, *B.D.* i. x, for *sutta* in such contexts meaning " rule," or " clause," rather than " discourse." Translated as " rule " at *Vin. Texts* iii. 317.

[9] *anubyañjanaso*. *VA*. 790 explains: *akkharapadapāripūriyā*, as to the completion of line and syllable.

[10] *VA*. 790, *madhurassara*, sweet-toned, sweet-voiced. *Cf. A.* ii. 97, iii. 114.

[11] *garudhamma*, esteemed or principal rule. *Vin. Texts* iii. 322 translates *garudhammā* as " chief rules," *G.S.* iv. 183 as " cardinal rules." Given in detail below and also at *Vin.* ii. 255; *A*. iv. 276. See also *Vin. Texts* i. 35, n. 2. These " important rules " were recited to Mahāpajāpatī when Gotama told her that women might become nuns, and they were to count as her ordination. *VA*. 790 says that in his time as a householder, he (*i.e.*, the monk agreed upon) had not committed unchastity with nuns, female novices or probationers.

[12] *VA*. 791, since his upasampadā ordination.

more than twenty years' standing. Monks, I allow you to agree upon a monk endowed with these eight qualities[1] as exhorter of nuns." || 2 || [51]

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not agreed upon means: not agreed upon by an (official) act at which the motion is put three times and then followed by the decision.[2]

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.[3]

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts concerning another rule,[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he exhorts one who has been ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

When that monk has been agreed upon, sweeping the cell, providing drinking water and water for washing, making ready a seat, taking a colleague,[5] they should sit down.[6] The nuns going there, greeting that monk, should sit down at a respectful distance. They should be asked by that monk: 'Sisters, are you all come?'[7] If they say: 'Master, we are all come,' he says: 'Sisters, are the eight important rules[8] being kept up?' If they say: 'Master, they are being kept up,' he, saying: 'This, sisters, is the exhortation,' should deliver it. If they

---

[1] The eight qualities are summarised at *VA*. 791.

[2] *ñatticatuttha kamma*. *Cf*. below, p. 275.

[3] *Cf*. above, p. 32.

[4] *aññena dhammena*.

[5] *dutiya*. *VA*. 792 says this means that a *dutiya* should be wanted for setting him free from offence in teaching dhamma; *cf*. above, p. 206, where in teaching dhamma to women a learned man should also be present.

[6] *nisīditabbaṃ*. *VA*. 792, "they should all sit down at the place of arrival, not at the outskirts of or in the middle of the vihāra, not at the door of the uposatha-hall or of the refectory."

[7] *samagga 'ttha bhaginiyo*. *Samagga* also means "in unity, harmonious," but *VA*. 792 explains by *sabbā āgaman' attha*, 'are you all come?'

[8] *garudhammā*, see above, p. 266.

say: 'Master, they are not being kept up,[1]' he should expound them[2]:

A nun who has been ordained (even) for a century[3] must greet respectfully, rise up from her seat, salute with joined palms, do proper homage to a monk ordained but that day. This rule is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.

A nun must not spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk.[4] This rule is to be honoured . . . her life.

Every half month a nun should desire[5] two things from the Order of monks: the asking (as to the date) of the Observance day,[6] and the coming for the exhortation.[7] This rule is to be honoured . . . her life.

After the rains, a nun must keep the ceremony held at the end of the rains[8] before both Orders, in respect

[1] *Vattanti=āgacchanti*, *VA*. 792.

[2] *osāretabbā*, but *VA*. 792 reads *osāretabbo*.

[3] See Horner, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 120, where the eight *garudhammā*, their infringements and remodelling are set out in some detail. These eight principal rules occur again at *Vin*. ii. 255.

[4] *abhikkhuke āvāse*. *G.S.* iv. 183, "where there is no resident monk." *VA*. 792 says, "if the monks giving exhortation do not live within half a yojana of the nunnery (or nuns' quarters), this means a residence without monks (*ayaṃ abhikkhuko āvāso nāma*)." For then she could not go for the exhortation. This rule is the same as the 56th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya, *Vin*. iv. 313.

[5] *paccāsiṃsitabbā*, expect or ask for. *VA*. 794 gives *icchitabbā*, desire.

[6] *I.e.*, whether it is to be held on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the month, see *Vin. Texts* iii. 323, n. 2, and *VA*. 794.

[7] *ovādupasaṃkamana*. Nuns should ask for this. *Cf*. *Vin*. iv. 315 and *VA*. 795. The vicissitudes which led to a monk going to the nuns, instead of the nuns to a monk, are set out at *VA*. 794 f., quoting *Vin*. ii. 263 ff. This rule is the same as the 59th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya, *Vin*. iv. 315. The 58th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya is that it is an offence for a nun not to go for exhortation.

[8] *pavāretabbaṃ*. At this ceremony, the *pavāraṇā*, monks and nuns were mutually invited to avow offences seen, heard, or suspected. *G.S.* iv. 183 translates "Invitation Festival." See *loc. cit.*, n. 3. Failure of a nun to keep this rule is a pācittiya for her, *Vin*. iv. 314, the 57th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya. Nuns' shortcomings with regard to the *pavāraṇā* are told at *Vin*. ii. 275, together with the means of carrying it out properly. *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 159

of three matters: what was seen, what was heard, what was suspected. This rule is to be honoured . . . her life.

A nun, offending against an important rule, must undergo the mānatta discipline[1] for half a month[2] before both Orders.[3] This rule . . . her life.

When, as a novice, she has trained in the six rules[4] for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders.[5] This rule . . . her life.

A monk is not to be reviled[6] or abused in any way[7] by a nun.[8] This rule . . . her life.

From today, admonition[9] of monks by nuns is forbidden, admonition of nuns by monks is not forbidden. This rule is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.

If, saying, 'Master, we are all come,' he speaks another rule, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, saying, 'Master, we are not all come,'[10] he speaks the eight important rules, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, not delivering[11] the exhortation, he speaks another rule, there is an offence of wrong-doing. || 1 || [52]

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act[12] when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it

---

[1] See *B.D.* i. 195-6. [2] *pakkhamānatta.*

[3] Eventually only nuns were allowed to carry out a formal act (*kamma*) against nuns, *Vin.* ii. 260, though not here specifically the mānatta.

[4] *I.e.*, for novices. Referred to, Bhikkhunī Pācittiyas 63-67.

[5] *Cf. Vin.* ii. 257, 271.

[6] *akkositabbo. Cf. akkosa,* "mode of address," at p. 171 above.

[7] *kenaci pariyāyena.* [8] =52nd Bhikkhunī Pācittiya.

[9] *vacanapatha.* Ed. *Vin. Texts* iii. 324 says, "the reference is, no doubt, to the various kinds of official admonitions given in detail in chapter 20 below"=*Vin.* ii. 276. *VA.* 800 says she should not exhort or instruct a monk; while *Comy.* on *A.* iv. 277 says that *vacanapatha* is *ovādanusāsanadhammakathā,* talk on dhamma and instruction and exhortation.

[10] *vagga.* See *Vin. Texts* i. 36, n. 2 (from p. 35), where it is said that "*vagga* is *vyagra,* the opposite of *samagga.*"

[11] *aniyyādetvā* is according to *VA.* 800 *avatvā.*

[12] The (legal) act is here the formal act (*kamma*) appointing the exhorter, *VA.* 800.

is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come . . . If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is not all come . . . thinking that they are all come . . . there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come . . . (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come . . . being in doubt . . . thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come . . . being in doubt . . . thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come . . . is in doubt . . . thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come . . . there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing . . . (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing . . . thinking that the Order of nuns is all come when it is all come, there is no offence. ||2||

There is no offence (in) giving an exposition,[1] giving an interrogation[2]; if he expounds being called upon:

[1] *Cf. Vin.* i. 75, ii. 219. *VA.* 808, "reciting the text of the eight important rules."

[2] *paripucchā. Cf.* below, pp. 275, 278, 395, and *Vin.* i. 70, ii. 219. *VA.* 800, "speaking an explanation on the text of the important rules."

'Expound, master '[1]; if she asks a question[2]; if, having asked a question, he speaks; if, talking for the good of another, nuns hear; if it is to a female probationer, if it is to a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[3] || 3 || **3** ||

The First [**53**]

[1] *VA*. 800, the important rules.

[2] *VA*. 801, " if a nun asks a question about the eight important rules or about the *khandhas*, whatever the monk says to that is no offence for him."

[3] *Cf*. pp. 207, 275.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders exhorted the nuns in turn.[1] Now at that time it came to be the turn of the venerable Cūḷapanthaka[2] to exhort the nuns. The nuns said:

"Now today the exhortation will not be effective,[3] for now master Cūḷapanthaka will speak the same stanza[4] again and again."

Then these nuns approached the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, and having approached and greeted the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Cūḷapanthaka spoke thus to these nuns:

"Sisters, are you all come?"[5]

"Master, we are all come."

"Sisters, are the eight important rules being kept up?"[6]

"They are being kept up, master."

"Sisters, this is the exhortation," (and) delivering (it) he spoke this stanza again and again:

> "For the sage, high-minded, zealous, trained in paths of wisdom,[7]
> For such, tranquil, ever mindful,[8] sorrows come not to be."[9]

---

[1] *pariyāyena.*

[2] At *A.* i. 23 called chief among monks skilled in creating forms by mind-power and mental "evolution." His verses are at *Thag.* 557-566. See *D.P.P.N* for details of his life.

[3] *Iddha, cf.* above, p. 263.

[4] *Udāna.*

[5] *Cf.* above, p. 267.

[6] *Cf.* above, p. 267.

[7] *monapatha. Cf. Sn.* 580. *SnA.* 435 explains as *ñāṇapatha. VA.* 801 says *mona* is *ñāṇa,* and *monapathesu sikkhato* means he is trained in three trainings, or in the paths of what is called the knowledge of arahanship, of wisdom (*monassa*), of the thirty-seven things belonging to enlightenment. Such a *muni* is one who has the cankers destroyed. On *mona* being silence, and *muni* a measurer and man of worth, see Mrs. Rhys Davids's translation of *Dhp.* 268-269 in *S.B.B.* vii. 91. Last line of *Dhp.* 269 quoted at *VA.* 801. *Cf. UdA.* 255.

[8] *sadā satīmato=S.* i. 81.

[9] *=Ud.* 43=*Thag.* 68.

The nuns spoke thus: "Is it not as we said? The exhortation will not now become effective today, for now master Cūḷapanthaka will speak the same stanza again and again."

The venerable Cūḷapanthaka heard this conversation of those nuns. Then the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, rising up above the ground,[1] paced up and down in the air, in the sky, then he stood, then he sat down, then he lay down in a sleeping-place, then he was obscured, then blazed forth, then he disappeared; he spoke this same stanza and another long utterance of the enlightened one. The nuns spoke thus:

"Indeed it is wonderful, good sir, indeed it is marvellous, good sir, indeed never before has an exhortation come to be so effective as this one of master Cūḷapanthaka."

Then the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, exhorting these nuns until the dark of the night, dismissed them, saying: "Go, sisters." Then these nuns, staying outside the town because the town-gate was closed, entered the town in the morning.[2] People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"These nuns are not leading the Brahma-life; having remained together with monks in the monastery, now they are entering the town."

Monks heard these people [54] who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Cūḷapanthakă exhort nuns after sunset?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Cūḷapanthaka, exhorted nuns after sunset?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, Cūḷapanthaka[3] . . . after sunset? Cūḷapanthaka, it is not for pleasing those who are not

---

[1] *vehāsa, cf. B.D.* i. 79.

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 401.

[3] Note Gotama calls him by his name here, and not *moghapurisa*, "foolish man."

(yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If a monk, even though agreed upon, should exhort nuns after sunset, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Agreed upon means: agreed upon by an (official) act at which the motion is put three times and then followed by the decision.[1]

After sunset means: after the sun has gone down.

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules or concerning another rule, there is an offence of expiation.[2] || 1 ||

If he thinks that (the sun) has set when it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it has not set when it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts one who has been ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it has set when it has not set, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it has not set, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it has not set when it has not set, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence (in) giving an exposition, giving an interrogation; if he expounds being called upon: 'Expound, master'; if she asks a question; if, having asked a question, he speaks; if, talking for the good of another, nuns hear; if it is to a female probationer, if it is to a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[3] || 3 || **2** ||

The Second

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 267.
[2] *Cf.* above, *ibid.*
[3] *Cf.* above, pp. 207, 272.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXIII

. . . among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.[1] Now at that time the group of six monks, approaching the nuns' quarters, exhorted the group of six nuns. Nuns spoke thus to the group of six nuns: " Come, ladies, [55] we will go for exhortation."

" Well, ladies, we would go for the sake of exhortation, (but) the group of the six masters exhort us in this very place."[2]

Those who were modest nuns . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the group of the six monks, approaching nuns' quarters, exhort nuns ?"

Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the group of six monks . . . exhort nuns ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . exhorted nuns ?"

" It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: " How can you, foolish men . . . exhort nuns ? Foolish men, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, approaching nuns' quarters, should exhort nuns, there is an offence of expiation."[3]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 94.

[2] *Idh' eva*, lit. " right here," as the Americans say.

[3] *Cf. Vin.* ii. 259, where the laity complain that the monks go to nuns' quarters to recite the Pātimokkha.

Now at that time Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid became ill. Monks who were elders approached Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid, and having approached they spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

" Gotami, we hope things are going well with you, we hope you are keeping going."

" Masters, things are not going well with me, I am not keeping going. Please, masters, give dhamma."

" Sister, it is not allowable, approaching nuns' quarters, to give dhamma to a nun," they said, and being scrupulous they did not give it. Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. As he was sitting down, the lord spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

" Gotami, I hope things are going well with you, I hope you are keeping going."

" Formerly, lord, monks who were elders, coming to me, gave dhamma: because of this comfort came to be for me.[1] But now they say it is forbidden by the lord, and being scrupulous they do not give it; because of this comfort does not come to be for me."

Then the lord having . . . delighted Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid with talk on dhamma, rising up from his seat, departed. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given dhamma-talk, addressed the monks, saying:

" I allow you, monks, approaching nuns' quarters, to exhort a nun who is ill. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: [56]

Whatever monk, approaching nuns' quarters, should exhort the nuns except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: if a nun comes to be ill; this, in this case, is a right time." || **2** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

[1] *Cf.* below, pp. 342, 399.

Nuns' quarters means: where nuns stay even for one night.

Approaching means: going there.

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules, there is an offence of expiation.

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

An ill nun means: if she is unable to go for exhortation or for communion.[1] || 1 ||

If he thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained, (and) approaching the nuns' quarters, exhorts her—except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is ordained . . . at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained . . . at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts (her) concerning a different rule, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he exhorts one who is ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is at a right time, (in) giving an exposition, giving an interrogation (*as* Pāc. XXII. **2**, 3) . . . if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Third

[1] *saṃvāsa.* For definition of this, see *Old Comy.'s* exegesis on *asaṃvāsa* in each Pārājika (*B.D.* i.).

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick.[1] The group of six monks spoke thus:

"The monks who are elders are not doing a service[2] in exhorting nuns; the monks who are elders [57] are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks speak thus: 'The monks who are elders . . . for the sake of gain'?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, spoke thus: 'The monks who are elders . . . for the sake of gain'?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, speak thus: 'The monks who are elders . . . for the sake of gain'? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should speak thus: 'The monks who are elders are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain,' there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] =p. 263.

[2] *na bahukatā. VA.* 804 says *na katabahumānā na dhamma-bahumānaṃ katvā*, "not revering, not doing reverence to dhamma," apparently not rendering a service.

For the sake of gain means: for the sake of robes, for the sake of alms-food, for the sake of lodgings, for the sake of the requisite of medicines for the sick, for the sake of honour, for the sake of respect, for the sake of reverence, for the sake of homage, for the sake of veneration.

Should speak thus means: if desiring to bring blame,[1] desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame[2] to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying: 'He is exhorting for the sake of robes . . . for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying: 'He is exhorting for the sake of robes . . . for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, desiring to bring blame . . . to bring shame to one not ordained,[3] agreed upon or not agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying, 'He is exhorting . . . for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence. || 2 ||

---

[1] *avaṇṇaṃ kattukāmo.* *Cf.* above, p. 236.
[2] *maṅkuṃ kattukāmo.* See above, p. 178 and n. 5.
[3] Such as a learned probationer, *VA.* 804.

There is no offence if he usually speaks exhorting for the sake of robes . . . for the sake of veneration; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Fourth [**58**]

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a monk was walking for alms in Sāvatthī along a certain road. And a nun was walking for alms along that road. Then that monk spoke thus to that nun: " Go, sister, in such and such a place alms-food is being given." And she spoke thus: " Go, master, in such and such a place alms-food is being given."

These had become friends through constantly seeing (one another). Now at that time robe-material was being distributed to the Order. Then that nun, going for exhortation, approached that monk, and having approached and greeted that monk, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, that monk spoke thus to that nun:

" Sister, this is my share of the robe-material, you may accept it."

" Yes, master, my robe is worn thin." Then that monk gave that nun the robe-material. Then that monk became one whose robe was worn thin. Monks spoke thus to this monk:

" Your reverence, make up your robe-material now." Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can a monk give robe-material to a nun ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, gave robe-material to a nun ?"

" It is true, lord."

" Is she a relation of yours, monk, or not a relation ?"

" She is not a relation, lord," he said.

" Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what

is right or what is wrong for a nun who is not a relation.[1] How can you, foolish man, give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Then scrupulous monks did not give robe-material in exchange to nuns.[2] The nuns . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the masters not give robe-material to us in exchange?" **[59]**

Monks heard these nuns who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you to give in exchange to five (classes of people): to a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, a female novice. I allow you, monks, to give in exchange to these five (classes of people). And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation."[3] || **2** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or the father's side back through seven generations.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 39, 44.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 39, where scrupulous monks did not accept robes in exchange.

[3] *Cf.* Nissag. V, where it is an offence for a monk to receive a robe from a nun who is not related, except in exchange.

[4] See above, p. 31.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-materials, (including) the least one fit for assignment.[1]

Except in exchange means: setting aside (the fact that) he gives in exchange, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) gives robe-material (to her), except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation . . . If he thinks that she is a relation when she is not a relation . . . there is an offence of expiation. If he gives robe-material to one ordained by one (Order only), except in exchange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if she is a relation; if there is an exchange; if there is a large thing for a small thing, or a small thing for a large thing; if a nun takes it on trust; if she takes it for the time being; if he gives another requisite, except robe-material; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[2] || 3 || **3** ||

The Fifth

[1] See above, p. 7.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 41, and below, p. 287.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXVI

. . . at Sāvatthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin[1] became skilled[2] in making robes. [60] A certain nun[3] approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Udāyin:

"Honoured sir, it were good if the master sewed a robe for me."

Then the venerable Udāyin, having sewed a robe for this nun, having made it well dyed, well worked, having raised[4] up a bold design[5] in the middle, having folded it up,[6] laid it aside. Then that nun approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Udāyin:

"Where, honoured sir, is that robe?"

"Come, sister, having taken this robe as it was folded up, having laid it aside, when the Order of nuns comes for exhortation, then, having put on this robe, come at the back of the Order of nuns."

---

[1] *VA.* 804 calls him Lāḷudāyi. See *D.P.P.N.*

[2] *paṭṭha.* Above, p. 109, same thing said of Upananda. *Cf.* also above, p. 42. [3] *VA.* 804 says she was his former wife.

[4] *vuṭṭhāpetvā*, *v.l.* *samuṭṭhāpetvā.*

[5] *paṭibhānacitta.* *VA.* 804 says *paṭibhānacittan ti attano paṭibhāṇena katacittaṃ, so kira cīvaraṃ rajitvā tassa majjhe nānāvaṇṇehi vippakatamethunaṃ itthipurisarūpaṃ akāsi*, which seems to mean a design (or painting, *citta*) made by his own wit (or ingenuity, intelligence). They say that he, dyeing the robe-material, made in the middle, with various colours, the form of a woman and a man in interrupted intercourse (so *P.E.D.* for *vippakatamethuna*). *Cf. Vin.* ii. 151, where the group of six monks had "imaginative drawings (*paṭibhānacitta*) painted on their vihāras, figures of men and figures of women" (*Vin. Texts* iii. 172, *q.v.*, n. 3). *Paṭibhānacitta* occurs again as being in a *cittāgāra*, picture-gallery, at *Vin.* iv. 298. [6] *saṃharitvā.* *Cf. Vin.* i. 46; ii. 117, 150.

Then that nun, having taken this robe as it was folded up, when the Order of nuns came for exhortation, then, having put on this robe, she came at the back of the Order of nuns. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How little these nuns fear blame, they are sly, they have no shame,[1] inasmuch as they raise up a bold design on a robe."

Nuns spoke thus: "Whose work is this?"

"Master Udāyin's," she said.

"A thing like this should not adorn these who have little fear of blame, who are sly, who have no shame. Is it not master Udāyin's?" they said.

Then the nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin sew a robe for a nun?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, sewed a robe for a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

"Is she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?"

"She is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasing or what is unpleasing for a woman who is not a relation. How can you, foolish man, sew a robe for a nun who is not a relation? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should sew or should cause a robe to be sewn for a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the

[1] =*Vin.* iii. 128=*B.D.* i. 214.

mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.[1]

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.[2]

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes.[3] [**61**]

Should sew means: if he himself sews, in each insertion of the awl[4] there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause to be sewn means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he sews much, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) sews or causes a robe to be sewn, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation . . . If he thinks that she is a relation when she is not a relation . . . there is an offence of expiation. If he sews or causes a robe to be sewn for one ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if she is a relation; if he sews or causes another requisite to be sewn, except a robe; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[5] || 3 || **2** ||

The Sixth

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 31, 47. [2] *Cf.* above, pp. 32, 40.

[3] *Cf.* below, p. 407. *VA.* 804 and 863 say this means that which he is able to put on, to dress in, using the verbs *nivāsetuṃ* and *pārupituṃ*, which refer to the inner robe and to the upper robe and outer cloak; see above, p. 32, nn. 2, 3. *VA.* 863 expressly says that the robe which is the least one fit for assignment is not meant (at *Vin.* iv. 120); presumably it is not meant here either.

[4] *ārāpathe.* [5] *Cf.* above, p. 284.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXVII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having arranged together with nuns, were going along the same high-road.[1] People . . . spread it about, saying:

"Just as we tour with our wives, so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, tour together with nuns."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, having arranged together with nuns, go along the same high-road?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . the same high-road?"

"It is true, lord." The enlightened one, the lord rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men . . . same high-road? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should go along the same high-road, even among villages,[2] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now[3] at that time several[4] monks and nuns **[62]** came to be going along the high-road from Sāketa

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 131, 133. [2] *gāmantaraṃ.*
[3] *Cf.* below, p. 292.
[4] *sambahulā*, usually in *Vin.* "two or three," a *gaṇa*.

to Sāvatthī. Then these nuns spoke thus to these monks:

"We will go along with the masters."

"Sisters, it is not allowable, having arranged together with a nun, to go along the same high-road. Either you go first, or we will go (first)."

"Honoured sirs, the masters are the highest men,[1] so let the masters go first."

Then as those nuns were going last thieves robbed them on the way and assaulted them. Then these nuns, having arrived at Sāvatthī, told this matter to the nuns. The nuns . . . to the monks. The monks . . . to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to go along the same high-road, having arranged together with a nun, if it is on a road agreed upon as dangerous, frightening,[2] (where) one must go with a weapon.[3] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should go along the same high-road, even among villages, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: if a road becomes agreed upon as dangerous, frightening, (where) one must go with a weapon. This is the right time in this case." || 2 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Together with means: together.

---

[1] *aggapurisa*, or foremost, chief among men.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 158, for these two words; and *cf. M.* i. 134.

[3] *satthagamanīya*. I follow rendering of *Vin. Texts* i. 37: "when the road is so insecure and dangerous that travellers on it have to carry arms," and not the "caravan-road" of *P.E.D.* For *Old Comy.'s* definition would, in conjunction with this phrase, make nonsense if "caravan-road" were meant. *Sattha* may be, more specifically, "knife," *cf.* Defeat III.

Having arranged[1] means: if one arranges, saying, 'We are going, sister, we are going, master, we are going, master, we are going, sister, we are going either today or tomorrow[2] or the next day,'[3] there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Even among villages means: in a village close enough for a cock (to walk),[4] among every (such) village,[5] there is an offence of expiation. For every half yojana[6] in what is not a village, in a jungle,[7] there is an offence of expiation.[8]

Except at the right time means: setting aside the right time.[9]

A road where one must go with a weapon means: it comes to be impossible to go without a weapon.

Dangerous[10] means: if, on this road, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are eating is seen, a place where they are resting is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.

Frightening[10] means: if on this road people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen. [**63**]

Having gone to a frightening (place), having seen that it is not frightening, they should be dismissed, with the words, 'Go, sisters.' || 1 ||

---

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 293, and *Vin.* iv. 131.

[2] *hiyyo*, usually "yesterday." *Cf.* Hindustani *kāl*, meaning both "yesterday" and "tomorrow."

[3] *pare*, or it can mean "in the future."

[4] *kukkuṭasampāte gāme. VA.* 806 says, "setting out from a village a cock goes on foot to another village." *Cf. kukkuṭasampātika* at *A.* i. 159, and *G.S.* i. 142, and n. 2; *D.* iii. 75, and *Dial.* iii. 72 and n. 2. Whole phrase seems to mean it is an offence to walk to a village that is so close that a cock could walk to it.

[5] *gāmantare gāmantare.*

[6] See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 16.

[7] See definition of "jungle" at *B.D.* i. 74, 85.

[8] *Cf.* below, p. 294, and *Vin.* iv. 131.

[9] To here from "together with" above, *cf.* below, p. 293, and *Vin.* iv. 131.

[10] *Cf.* above, p. 158, and *MA.* ii. 109.

If he thinks that it was arranged when it was arranged, (and) goes along the same high-road even among villages, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it was arranged . . . If he thinks that it was not arrranged when it was arranged . . . there is an offence of expiation. If a monk arranges (and) a nun does not arrange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was arranged when it was not arranged, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not arranged, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not arranged when it was not arranged, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is at the right time; if he goes not having arranged; if the nun arranges (and) the monk does not arrange; if they go without (making) a rendezvous[1]; if there are dangers[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[3] || 3 || **3** ||

The Seventh

---

[1] *visaṃketena.* *VA.* 807, "If they say: we will go before the meal, and they go after the meal; if they say: we will come today, and they go on the morrow, thus as it is not at the time of the rendezvous (*kālavisaṃkete*) there is no offence." *Cf.* *asaṃketena* above, p. 239, n. 3.

[2] *VA.* 807, "when there is dissension in the kingdom and the country people mount their carts and drive away"; a stock phrase, *cf.* *A.* i. 178, iii. 66, 104.

[3] *Cf.* below, p. 294, and *Vin.* iv. 132, 133.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having arranged together with (some) nuns, embarked in one boat. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"Just as we amuse ourselves in a boat with our wives, so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having arranged together with nuns, amuse themselves in a boat."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, having arranged together with nuns, embark in one boat?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having arranged together with nuns, embarked in one boat?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men . . . embark in one boat? It is not, foolish men . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should embark in one boat, going either upstream or downstream, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** || [**64**]

Now[1] at that time several monks and nuns were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvatthī. On the way there was a river to be crossed. Then these nuns spoke thus to these monks:

"We will cross over together with the masters."

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 288.

"Sisters, it is not allowable, having arranged together with a nun, to embark in one boat. Either you cross over first, or we will cross over (first)."

"Honoured sirs, the masters are the highest men, so let the masters cross over first."

Then as those nuns were crossing over last thieves robbed them and assaulted them. Then these nuns, having arrived at Sāvatthī, told this matter to the nuns. The nuns . . . to the monks. The monks . . . to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to embark in one boat, having arranged together with a nun, if it is for crossing over to the other bank. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should embark in one boat, going either upstream or downstream, except for crossing over to the other bank, there is an offence of expiation." || 2 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Together with means: together.

Having arranged[1] means: if one arranges, saying, 'We are embarking, sister, we are embarking, master, we are embarking, master, we are embarking, sister, we are embarking either today or tomorrow or the next day,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If the monk embarks when the nun has embarked, there is an offence of expiation. If the nun embarks when the monk has embarked, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both embark there is an offence of expiation.

Going upstream[2] means: upstream.[3]

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 290.

[2] *uddhaṃgāminī.* *VA.* 808, "going against the stream of the river."

[3] *ujjavanikāya.* Inst. fem., used as adj. *Cf. Vin.* ii. 290.

Going downstream[1] means: downstream.[2]

Except for crossing over to the other bank means: setting aside for crossing over to the other bank.

In a village close enough for a cock (to walk), among every (such) village, there is an offence of expiation. For every half yojana in what is not a village, in a jungle, there is an offence of expiation.[3] || 1 ||

If he thinks that it was arranged when it was arranged (and) embarks in the same boat, going either upstream or downstream, except for crossing over to the other bank, [**65**] there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it was arranged . . . (see Pāc. XVII. **3**, 2) . . . no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is for crossing over to the other bank[4]; if they embark not having arranged; if the nun arranges (and) the monk does not arrange; if they embark without (making) a rendezvous; if there are dangers; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[5] || 3 || **3** ||

The Eighth

---

[1] *adhogāminī*. [2] *ojavanikāya*.

[3] *Cf.* above, p. 290, and *Vin.* iv. 131.

[4] *VA.* 809 says, 'here it is not only the river, for there is no offence for one who goes from the port of a great ford to Tāmalitti or Suvaṇṇabhūmi.' Tāmalitti was a sea-port (the modern Tamluk), formerly on the estuary of the Ganges, and the port from where Asoka sent the branch of the Bodhi-tree to Ceylon.

Suvaṇṇabhūmi is the modern Cambodia (*P.E.D.*); or more probably Lower Burma (Pegu and Moulmein districts), according to B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 70, the Pagan and Moulmein districts, according to *D.P.P.N.*; mentioned at *Nd.* i. 155, *Sāsanavaṃsa* 10, where it is said that it stands near the great sea.

[5] *Cf.* above, p. 291.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXIX

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā[1] came to frequent a certain family as a regular diner. And monks who were elders came to be invited by that householder. Then the nun Thullanandā, dressing in the morning, taking her bowl and robe, approached that family, and having approached, she said to that householder:

"Householder, why is this abundant solid food and soft food prepared ?"

"Lady, elders are invited by me."

"But who are the elders for you, householder ?"

"Master Sāriputta,[2] master Moggallāna the Great,[3] master Kaccāna the Great,[4] master Koṭṭhita the Great,[5] master Kappina the Great,[6] master Cunda the Great,[7] master Anuruddha,[8] master Revata,[9] master Upāli,[10] master Ānanda,[11] master Rāhula.[12]"

---

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 110; *Vin.* iv. 211, 332 ff.; *S.* ii. 219, 222.

[2] Chief of the disciples of great wisdom, *A.* i. 23. See *Pss. Breth.* 340. For reference to all these, see *Pss. Breth.*; *G.S.* i. 16-20; and *D.P.P.N.*

[3] Chief of the disciples of psychic potencies, *A.* i. 23. See *Pss. Breth.* 382.

[4] Chief of the disciples who are expounders in full of brief sayings, *A.* i. 23. See *Pss. Breth.* 238.

[5] Chief of the disciples who are masters of logical analysis, *A.* i. 24. See *Pss. Breth.* 6.

[6] Chief of the disciples who are exhorters of monks, *A.* i. 25. See *Pss. Breth.* 254.

[7] Not specially distinguished in *A.* i. See *Pss. Breth.* 118.

[8] Chief of the disciples who are of deva-sight; *A.* i. 23. See *Pss. Breth.* 325.

[9] Revata Khadiravaniya, "the acacia woodlander"; at *A.* i. 24 is called "chief of the jungle-dwellers," while Kaṅkhā-revata is there called chief of musers. *VA.* does not say which one is meant. See *Pss. Breth.* 45, 279, 7.

[10] Chief of those versed in Vinaya, *A.* i. 25. See *Pss. Breth.* 168. Also *B.D.* i. Index.

[11] Chief of those of wide learning, of those who are mindful, of those of good behaviour, of those who are resolute, of personal attendants, *A.* i. 24 f. See *Pss. Breth.* 349.

[12] Chief of those desirous of training, *A.* i. 24. See *Pss. Breth.* 183, Gotama's only son.

"But why did you, householder, invite fellows[1] posing as[2] great heroes[3]?"

"But who are the great heroes for you, sister?"

"Master Devadatta, master Kokālika, master Kaṭamorakatissaka, master the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, master Samuddadatta."[4]

Now this chance talk[5] of the nun Thullanandā was interrupted[6] when these monks who were elders entered. She said:

"Householder, is it true that the great heroes are invited by you?"[7]

"You, lady, called (them) now 'fellows,' now 'great heroes,'" he said, and he turned her out of the house and put an end to regular dining. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can Devadatta eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun?"[8]

. . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Devadatta, ate alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: [66]

Whatever monk should eat alms-food knowing that

---

[1] *cetaka*. Under *ceṭaka*, *P.E.D.*, referring to this passage, gives "servant, slave, (bad) fellow," while for *cetaka* it gives "decoy-bird." *Comy.* of no help.

[2] *tiṭṭhamāna*.

[3] *Mahānāga*, *nāga* also meaning snake or elephant.

[4] The schismatics of Saṅgh. X, XI, see *B.D.* i.

[5] *antarākathā*. *Cf. Ud.* 11.

[6] *vippakatā*, interrupted, broken off, left unfinished, but *VA*. 808 reads *vippakathā 'ti kayiramānā hoti* (*v.l. honti*).

[7] *VA*. 808, "looking round as the elders came in, she spoke thus, knowing that they had heard her."

[8] *bhikkhunīparipācita*; *VA*. 809, "procuring it, making it be taken by explaining its qualities."

it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time a certain monk who had gone forth from Rājagaha arrived at a family of (his) relations. People, saying: "At last the revered sir[1] is come," duly made ready a meal. A nun who frequented that family spoke thus to these people:

"Sirs, give a meal to the master."

Then that monk, thinking: "It is forbidden by the lord to eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun," being scrupulous, did not accept it; he was not able to walk for alms, he became famished.[2] Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, if there is a prior arrangement with the householder.[3] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of expiation." || **2** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or she herself tells him.[4]

---

[1] *bhaddanto.* [2] *chinnabhatta.*

[3] *pubbe gihisamārambhe,* a prior undertaking on the part of the householder. *VA.* 809 says *samārambha* is a synonym for *paṭiyādita,* given, arranged, prepared.

[4] *Cf.* above, pp. 161, 261; below, p. 333.

A nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Procures means: previously not desirous of giving, not desirous of treating him, if she says: "The master is a repeater, the master is very learned, the master is versed in the Suttantas, the master is an expert in Vinaya, the master is a speaker of dhamma, give to the master, treat the master": this means procures.

Alms-food means: any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.[1]

Unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder means: setting aside the arrangement with the householder.

An arrangement with the householder means: they are relations or they are invited[2] or they are ordinarily prepared (for the monk).[3]

If he says: 'I will eat,' and accepts (a meal), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For each mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 || [67]

If he thinks that it is procured when it is procured (and) eats it, unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt[4] as to whether it is procured (and) eats . . . with the householder, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not procured[4] when it is procured (and) eats . . . with the householder, there is no offence. If he eats what is procured through (the intervention of) one ordained by one (Order only), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is procured when it is not procured, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether

[1] *Cf.* below, p. 305. These five kinds of meals are enumerated below, p. 330.

[2] *pavārita*.

[3] *pakatipaṭiyatta*. *VA*. 809, they (*i.e.*, meals) are usually prepared (*paṭiyādita*) for that very monk, with the words, 'we will give to the elder.'

[4] Oldenberg at *Vin*. IV. 359 says that in these two cases the MS. called C. has *āpatti pācittiyassa*, an offence of expiation.

it is not procured, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not procured when it is not procured, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if there is a prior arrangement with the householder; if a female probationer procures it, if a female novice procures it; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any others[1]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Ninth

[1] *I.e.*, in eating rice-gruel, cakes, and fruits prepared for a nun, *VA*. 809. *Cf.* below, pp. 305, 314, 320.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the former wife of the venerable Udāyin[1] had gone forth among the nuns. She frequently came to the venerable Udāyin, and the venerable Udāyin frequently went to this nun. Now at one time the venerable Udāyin was sitting down in a private place together with this nun, the one with the other.[2] Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, sat down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation."[3] || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

---

[1] Mentioned in Saṅgh. II-V, to which *VA*. 809 refers, always in connection with women. In both Aniyatas, he is discovered sitting in private with a laywoman. Opening phrases of this Pāc.= Nissag. IV.

[2] *eko ekāya*.

[3] *Cf.* Pāc. XLIV, XLV.

Together with means: together.

The one with the other means: there is a monk and also a nun. **[68]**

A private place means: private from the eye, private from the ear. Private from the eye means: if covering the eye, or raising the eyebrow, or raising the head, he is unable to see. Private from the ear means: it is impossible to hear ordinary talk[1] (from him and the woman).

Should sit down means: if a nun is sitting and a monk comes to be sitting or lying down close (to her), there is an offence of expiation; if a monk is sitting and a nun comes to be sitting or lying down close (to him), there is an offence of expiation. Or if both are sitting or if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation.[2] || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a private place when it is a private place (and) sits down, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a private place . . . If he thinks that it is not a private place when it is a private place . . . is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a private place when it is not a private place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a private place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a private place when it is not a private place, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if he stands, does not sit; if he is not desirous of a private place; if he sits down thinking about something else[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 3 || **2** ||

The Tenth

---

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 332, and below, pp. 358, 361.
[2] *Cf.* below, pp. 358, 361.
[3] *aññāvihita.*
[4] *Cf.* below, p. 358, and *Vin.* iv. 269.

This is its key:

Not agreed upon, the setting sun, quarters, gain, because of a gift, he sews,
A high-road, a boat, should eat, the one with the other: these ten.

The Third Division: that on Exhortation

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, not far from Sāvatthī, alms-food came to be prepared in a public rest-house[1] by some guild. The group of six monks, dressing in the morning, taking their bowls and robes, entering Sāvatthī for alms-food, (but) not obtaining alms-food, went to the public rest-house. People, saying: "At last the revered ones are come," duly waited upon them. Then the group of six monks also on the second day . . . also on the third day, dressing in the morning . . . going to the public rest-house, ate (a meal). Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"What difference do we make?[2] Having gone to the monastery, then tomorrow[3] it will be right to return just here."[4] Staying on and on[5] just there, [**69**] they ate alms-food at the public rest-house. Followers of other sects went away. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, staying on and on, eat alms-food at the public rest-house? The alms-food at the public rest-house is not prepared merely[6] for them, the alms-food at the public rest-house is prepared simply[6] for everybody."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, staying on and on, eat alms-food at a public rest-house?" . . .

---

[1] *āvasathapiṇḍa*. See *Vin. Texts* i. 37, n. 3, for information and references. *Cf.* *āvasathâgāra*, above, p. 198.

[2] *kiṃ mayaṃ karissāma*.

[3] *hiyyo*. *VA*. 810 reads *bhīyyo pi ti sve pi*.

[4] *idh'eva āgantabbaṃ bhavissati*.

[5] *anuvasitvā anuvasitvā*.

[6] *eva*.

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . rest-house?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men . . . rest-house? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

One meal at a public rest-house may be eaten. If he should eat more than that, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time the venerable Sāriputta, going to Sāvatthī through the Kosalan country, approached a certain public rest-house. People saying: "At last the elder is come," duly waited upon (him). Then when the venerable Sāriputta had eaten, a painful affliction arose, he was not able to leave that public rest-house. Then on the second day these people spoke thus to the venerable Sāriputta: "Eat, honoured sir." Then the venerable Sāriputta, thinking: "It is not allowed by the lord, staying on and on, to eat alms-food at a public rest-house," and being scrupulous, he did not accept; he became famished. Then the venerable Sāriputta, having gone to Sāvatthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, staying on and on, to eat alms-food at a public rest-house. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

One meal in a public rest-house may be eaten by a monk who is not ill. If he should eat more than that, there is an offence of expiation." || **2** ||

Not ill means: he is able to leave that public rest-house. *Ill* means: he is not able to leave that public rest-house. [**70**]

Meal in a public rest-house means: any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals[1]; as much as is wanted[2] is prepared, not specially for him,[3] in a hall or in a hut[4] or at the foot of a tree or in the open air.

By a monk who is not ill means: (a meal) may be eaten once (only). If he accepts more than that, thinking: "I will eat," there is an offence of wrong-doing; for each mouthful, there is an offence of expiation.[5] || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) eats more than a meal at a public rest-house, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ill . . . If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he is ill; if he eats once when he is not ill; if he eats going out or coming in; if the proprietors, having invited him, offer him food, if it is specially[6] prepared (for him); if what is prepared is not as much as is wanted[7]; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals there is no offence in (eating) any others[8]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The First

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 298; below, p. 330.
[2] *yāvadattho.* *VA.* 810, "such a lot of food not being allotted."
[3] *anodissa.* *VA.* 810, "prepared for all."
[4] *maṇḍapa.*
[5] *Cf.* above, p. 298.
[6] *odissa*, thus disproving *P.E.D.*'s "only in neg."
[7] *VA.* 811, "and he takes very little."
[8] *Cf.* above, p. 299; below, pp. 314, 320.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time[1] Devadatta, gain and honour lost,[2] ate with his friends, having asked and asked[3] among households. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, eat, having asked and asked among households? Who is not fond of well-cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?"[4]

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can Devadatta eat with his friends, having asked and asked among households?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Devadatta, ate with your friends, having asked and asked among households?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, eat with your friends, having asked and asked among households? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* ii. 196. *Vin. Texts* iii. 250, n. 2, referring to this Pāc., says that it is "a rule the previous existence of which is implied in the decision given here"—*i.e.*, that (not more than) three monks shall eat a group meal at people's houses. Whoever does so shall be dealt with *yathādhamma*, according to the rule—this means Pāc. XXXII.

[2] *pahīnalābhasakkāra.* Even Ajātasattu turned against him, when Devadatta, attempting to murder the Buddha, had a fierce elephant let loose on the road by which Gotama was to travel. See *VA.* 811. Whole story told *Vin.* ii. 184 ff.

[3] *viññāpetvā viññāpetvā.*

[4] =below, p. 341.

In a group-meal,[1] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 || [71]

Now at that time people invited ill monks to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord." They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 ||

Now at that time people, at the time of giving robes, having prepared a meal with the robes, invited monks, saying: "Having offered food, we will clothe (you) with robes." The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord."

[1] *gaṇabhojane*, group- or party-meal. Two to four monks constitute a *gaṇa*, group. See *Old Comy.* below, and *VA.* 812. *Vin. Texts* i. 38, ii. 151, "in a body"—*i.e.*, a meal taken in a body, a group, instead of singly. At *Vin.* ii. 196 one of the three reasons why monks may not eat in a body is *kulânuddayā*, compassion for households. Unrestricted, obviously they might become too heavy a burden. But at *Vin.* i. 254 a group-meal is allowable after the making of the kaṭhina cloth. *Gaṇabhojana*, *paramparabhojana* (Pāc. XXXIII) and *(an)atirittabhojana* (Pāc. XXXV) form the subject of a controverted point at *Kvu.* 552. At *Vism.* 67 one of the advantages of being a *piṇḍapātika*, almsman, living more or less on scraps, is said to be that such a monk will not fall into the offences, contained in this section of the Vinaya, of eating a group-meal or an out-of-turn meal.

Little robe-material accrued (to them).[1] They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at a time of giving robes, to eat a group-meal.[2] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **3** ||

Now at that time people, at the (time of) making robes,[3] invited monks to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at a time of making robes, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **4** ||

Now at one time monks [**72**] were going on a journey together with (some) men. Then these monks said to these men:

"Sirs, wait a moment, we will go for alms-food." These said:

"Honoured sirs, eat just here." The monks, being

---

[1] *uppajjati*. *VA*. 811 says, "Not taking the meal they did not give robes, therefore little accrued." *Cf*. below, pp. 318, 364. Here *Vin*. *Texts* i. 38, n. 4, says this exception was "simply to guard against the stock of robes falling short." *Cf*. *Vin*. *Texts* ii. 150, n. 1.

[2] *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 254.

[3] *cīvarakārake*. Here *samaya* is omitted; it is inserted in the "allowance" and in the "rule," *cīvarakārasamaya*, below.

scrupulous, did not accept (food), saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord." They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at a time of going on a journey, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **5** ||

Now at that time monks were going in a boat together with (some) men. Then these monks said to these men:

"Sirs, take us to the bank for a moment, we will go for alms-food." These said:

"Honoured sirs, eat just here." The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept (food), saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord." . . .

"I allow you, monks, at a time of being embarked in a boat, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey, a time of being embarked in a boat; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **6** ||

Now at that time, monks having spent the rains in (various) districts,[1] came to Rājagaha to see the lord. People, having seen the monks from various parts of

[1] *Disā.*

the country,[1] invited them to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent.

"I allow you, monks, to eat a group-meal when there is a great scarcity.[2] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness . . . a time of embarking in a boat, when there is a great scarcity; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 7 || [73]

Now at one time a blood-relation of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had gone forth among the Naked Ascetics. Then that Naked Ascetic approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having approached, he spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

"I, sire, wish to make a meal for all heretics."[3]

"If, you, honoured sir, would first entertain the Order of monks with the enlightened one at their head, you might do this."

Then that Naked Ascetic sent a messenger to the monks, saying:

"Let the monks consent to (take) a meal with me on the morrow."

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: "A group-meal is forbidden by the lord." Then that Naked Ascetic approached the lord, and having approached he exchanged friendly greetings with the lord, and having exchanged greetings of friendliness

---

[1] *nānāverajjake*, or various provinces, different kingdoms. *Cf.* *A*. iii. 263.

[2] *mahāsamaye*. See *Old Comy*. below, and *VA*. 813. Four monks may not beg, but when a great scarcity comes, this rule is waived, otherwise it might be impossible for all to get a meal. *Samaya* also means both time and concourse; for the latter, *cf.* Mahāsamayasuttanta of *D*.

[3] *sabbapāsaṇḍikabhatta*.

and courtesy, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, that Naked Ascetic spoke thus to the lord:

"The revered Gotama is gone forth; I, too, am gone forth. One who has gone forth is worthy to accept the alms-food of one who has gone forth. Let the revered Gotama consent to (take) a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks."

The lord consented by becoming silent. Then that Naked Ascetic, having obtained the lord's consent, departed. Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to eat a group-meal at a meal-time of recluses.[1] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case, a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey, a time of being embarked in a boat, when there is a great scarcity, a meal-time of recluses; this is a right time in this case."
||8||

Group-meal means: when four monks eat, invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals, this is called a group-meal.

Except at a right time means: setting a right time to one side.

Time of illness means: even when the feet become split[2]; this means that at a time of illness (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Time of giving robes means: the last month of the rainy season when the kaṭhina cloth is not (formally)

---

[1] *samaṇabhattasamaya*. *Samaṇa* is a member of a permanent body, either belonging to Gotama's Order, *saddhammika*, or to another ascetic body, *aññatitthiya*.

[2] *pādâpi phālitā honti*, so that a monk cannot go to a village for alms, *VA*. 812. Not an uncommon complaint among people who usually go barefoot.

made, the five months when the kaṭhina cloth is (formally) made[1]; this means that at the time of giving robes (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Time of making robes means: when the robes are being made; this means that at the time of making robes (a group-meal) may be eaten. [74]

Time of going on a journey means: if he thinks: "I will go for half a yojana," (a group-meal) may be eaten, it may be eaten by him going out, it may be eaten by him coming in.[2]

Time of being embarked in a boat means: if he thinks: "I will embark in a boat," (a group-meal) may be eaten, it may be eaten by him embarking, it may be eaten by him disembarking.

A great scarcity means: when two or three monks, walking for alms-food, keep themselves going, (but) when a fourth has come they do not keep themselves going; this means that when there is a great scarcity (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Meal-time of recluses means: whoever makes a meal, being one who has attained (to the stage of) a wanderer,[3] this means that at the meal-time of recluses (a group-meal) may be eaten.

If, *except at the right time*, he accepts (food), thinking, "I will eat," there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a group-meal when it is a group-meal, (and) eats, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a group-meal . . . If he thinks that it is not a group-meal when it is a group-meal . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a group-meal when it is not a group-meal, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a group-meal,

[1] =below, p. 366. *Cf.* above, pp. 5, 26, for *atthata kaṭhina*.

[2] *Cf.* below, p. 405.

[3] *paribbājakasamāpanna*. *VA*. 813 says this is a certain one among co-religionists and members of other sects. For definition of *paribbājaka*, see *Vin*. iv. 92, 285.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a group-meal when it is not a group-meal, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is at a right time; if two or three eat together[1]; if having walked one by one for alms, they eat having assembled together; if it is the regular supply of food; if it is food (allowed by) ticket[2]; if it is (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon,[3] if it is (given) on an Observance day,[4] if

[1] *VA.* 814 distinguishes five groups of four persons: (1) those not invited, where one of those invited does not come, but someone else arrives and receives food: no offence; (2) those going for alms, where one does not accept the invitation but receives his share as he is going to the village: no offence; (3) those not ordained, when monks are invited with a probationer: no offence; (4) those sending out their bowls, where one going away sends out his bowl: no offence; (5) those who are ill, where monks are invited with one who is ill: no offence for the ill one.

[2] *salākabhatta.* At times when alms-food was short, food-tickets were issued (*salākāvutta*) by a monk in charge of the meals—a kind of steward. See, *e.g.*, *B.D.* i. 11, 26, 151. This and the next three terms occur at *Vin.* i. 58, 96; ii. 175. At *Vin.* i. 58=96 these four kinds of meals, together with those derived from three other sources, are called " extra allowances," while at *Vism.* 66 it is said that the almsman, *piṇḍapātika* (one who follows an ascetic practice), should not accept fourteen kinds of meals, including food given by ticket and the next three kinds, as above. At *Vin.* ii. 175, at a time when Rājagaha was short of alms-food, Gotama allows the monks to obtain food in each of these (seven) ways. This and the next (as *pakkhikabhatta*) occur also at *Jā.* ii. 209 f.

[3] *pakkhikaṃ.* *Cf.* *Vism.* 66, translated at *Path of Purity* i. 75, " on the day of the waxing or waning of the month "; this emphasises the lunar control of such givings rather better than does the " each fortnight " of *Vin. Texts* i. 173, or the " during a fortnight " of *Vin. Texts* iii. 220. See *Vin. Texts* iii. 220, n. 6, and *P.E.D.* A fortnight, however, was one half of the lunar month: the light, moonlit half, or the dark, moonless half. *Pakkhikaṃ* means food given any day once a fortnight, while the next two expressions each refer to a particular day in the fortnight.

[4] *uposathikaṃ*, the last day of each fortnight—*i.e.*, either the full moon day or the dark moon day. *Uposathika* is a fasting day for the lay people, but monks recite the Pātimokkha then, therefore it is a day to be observed or kept. Months are calculated from *uposathika.* As it is the last day of each fortnight, the day after it is the beginning of a month.

it is (given) on the day after an Observance day[1]; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any other[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **9** ||

The Second

[1] *pāṭipadikaṃ*. *Path of Purity* i. 75 has "on the first day of the moonlit fortnight"—*i.e.*, at the beginning of a month, full moon to new moon or new moon to full moon.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 299, 305.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXIII

. . . at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the hall of the Gabled Roof. Now at that time in Vesālī a succession of meals of sumptuous foods came to be arranged.[1] Then it occurred to a certain poor workman: " This[2] will not be inferior, in that these people duly prepare a meal. What now if I were to prepare a meal ?" Then that poor workman approached Kirapatika,[3] and having approached, he said to Kirapatika:

" I, master,[4] want [75] to prepare a meal for the Order of monks with the enlightened one at the head. Give me a wage."

Now Kirapatika had faith and was virtuous. Then Kirapatika gave more than a wage[5] to this poor workman. Then the poor workman went up to the lord, and having gone up, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the poor workman spoke thus to the lord:

" Lord, may the lord, together with the Order of monks, consent to a meal with me tomorrow."

" But, sir, do find out, the Order of monks is large."

" Lord, let the Order of monks be large. Many are the jujube fruits[6] prepared by me, the things to be

---

[1] *Vesāliyaṃ paṇītānaṃ bhattānaṃ bhattapaṭipāṭi adhiṭṭhitā hoti. Cf. Vin.* i. 248, *Kusinārāyaṃ . . . hoti*, translated *Vin. Texts* ii. 138, " a succession had been fixed, in which the inhabitants of Kusināra should each in succession provide food for the Saṅgha."

[2] *VA.* 816, this teaching or this gift to the Order.

[3] A clansman (*kulaputta*) named Kira, evidently influential (*patika*), giving out work and paying wages monthly, by the season, by the year, *VA.* 817. Mentioned nowhere but here, I believe.

[4] *ayyaputta.* [5] *abbhatireka vetana.*

[6] *badara.*

drunk[1] will be perfect on account of the juice of the jujube fruits."[2]

The lord consented by becoming silent. Then that poor workman, having obtained the lord's consent, having risen up from the seat, having greeted the lord, departed, keeping his right side towards him. Monks heard it said:

"The Order of monks, with the enlightened one at the head, is invited for tomorrow by a poor workman. The things to be drunk will be perfect on account of the juice of jujube fruits." These ate, walking for alms that morning. People heard it said: "The Order of monks, with the enlightened one at the head, is invited by the poor workman." These conveyed much solid food and soft food for the poor workman. Then that poor workman, at the end of that night, having had sumptuous solid food and soft food prepared, had the time announced to the lord, saying:

"Lord, it is time, the meal is ready."

Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the poor workman's dwelling, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then that poor workman served the monks in a refectory. The monks spoke thus:

"Sir, give a little, give a little, sir."

He said: "Do not you, honoured sirs, accept so very little saying, 'This is a poor workman.' Much solid food and soft food was prepared for me. Honoured sirs, accept as much as you please."

"Sir, it is not for this reason that we accept so very little, but we ate, having walked for alms this morning; that is why we are accepting so very little."

---

[1] *peyya.*

[2] *badaramissena.* *VA.* 817 explains by *badarasāḷavena.* According to *P.E.D.*, *badaramissa* is "mixture or addition of the juice of the jujube fruits," while it says that *sāḷava* is "perhaps a kind of salad." At *Asl.* 320 *lapila*, *cf.* *lambila*, bitter or astringent, is defined as *badarasāḷava-kapiṭṭhasāḷavādi*, the *s°* of the jujube, the *s°* of the wood-apple is astringent.

Then that poor workman looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered sirs, invited by me, eat elsewhere?[1] Yet am I not competent[2] to give as much as they please?"

Monks heard this poor workman who . . . [76] spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, invited somewhere, eat elsewhere?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monks, invited somewhere, ate elsewhere?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men . . . eat elsewhere? It is not, monks . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In an out-of-turn meal,[3] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

---

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 66, where monks accepted lodgings elsewhere, thus annoying their would-be host, who also refers to them as *bhaddantā*.

[2] *na câhaṃ paṭibalo.* Oldenberg, *Vin.* iv. 359, says: "The 'na' appears not to be correct." It is only correct if the sentence is interrogative, *na ca*=but not.

[3] *paramparabhojane. Vin. Texts* i. 38, "there is pācittiya in taking food in turn," with note (*q.v.*) to say, "that is, in picking and choosing with regard to food, or in regard to different invitations. The Bhikkhus were to eat straight on whatever was given, and to accept invitations in the order in which they were received." *P.E.D.* gives phrase as "taking food in succession," successive feeding. Gogerly, *J.R.A.S.*, 1862, p. 445, gets the gist of the notion without literal accuracy: "If a priest eat his ordinary meal when under an invitation to dine, except on allowed occasions, it is Pāchittiyan." Also Dickson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1876, p. 112: "A sin is committed when a priest takes food in any other order than that in which it is offered to him." Huber, *J. As.*, Nov.-Dec., 1913, does not attempt a translation. *Path of Purity* i. 76 calls it "a meal subsequent to the acceptance of a previous one." This kind of meal should not be accepted by the *piṇḍapātika*, almsman; see above, p. 307, n. 1.

Now at that time a certain monk became ill. A monk, taking alms-food, went up to that monk, and having gone up he spoke thus to that monk: "Eat, your reverence."

"Very well, your reverence, but there is for me the expectation of a meal."

Alms-food was conveyed to that monk in the evening. That monk did not eat as much as expected. They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, to eat an out-of-turn meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In an out-of-turn meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case, a right time is a time of illness; this is a right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **2** ||

At that time people, at the time of giving robes, having had a meal prepared together with the robes, invited monks, saying: "Having offered food, we will present (you) with robes." The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: "It is forbidden by the lord to eat an out-of-turn meal." . . . (See Pāc. XXXII. **3, 4**) . . . ". . . should be set forth:

In an out-of-turn meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes; this is a right time in this case."[1]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **3** ||

Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl [**77**] and robe, with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant,[2] came up to a certain household, and having

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 308; below, p. 365. [2] *Cf. B.D.* i. 20, n. 1.

come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then these people gave a meal to the lord and to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda, being scrupulous, did not accept (it).

"Take it, Ānanda," he said.

"Very well, lord, (but) there is for me the expectation of a meal."

"Well now, Ānanda, having assigned it (to another), take (this food)."

Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, having assigned (food to another), to eat an out-of-turn meal. And thus, monks, should it be assigned: 'I will give the meal that I am expecting to so and so.'"[1] || **4** ||

An out-of-turn meal means: invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals, having set this to one side, if he eats any one other meal of the five (kinds of) meals, this means an out-of-turn meal.

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

Time of illness means: sitting in one seat he is not able to eat as much as he pleases: this means that at a time of illness (an out-of-turn meal) may be eaten.

Time of giving robes means: . . . *Time of making robes* means: . . . (see Pāc. XXXII).

If, except at a right time, he accepts (food), saying: "I will eat . . ." (see Pāc. XXXII. **9,** 1, 2) . . . If he thinks that it is not an out-of-turn meal when it is not an out-of-turn meal there is no offence. || **1** ||

There is no offence if it is at a right time; if he eats, having assigned (a meal); if he eats two or three invita-

[1] Either to one who is present, or if he sees no one, then he should assign it to one person among the five kinds of his co-religionists, *VA.* 817.

tions together[1]; if he eats the invitations in succession[2]; if invited by a whole village he eats anywhere in that village; if invited by a whole guild he eats anywhere in that guild; if being invited, he speaks saying: "I will take alms-food"[3]; if it is the regular supply of food; if it is food (allowed by) ticket; if it is (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon; if it is (given) on an Observance day; if it is (given) on the day after an Observance day; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any other; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 2 || **5** ||

The Third

[1] *VA.* 817, two or three families invite him, and he puts the food into one bowl, eats it in one place.

[2] *nimantanapaṭipāṭiyā bhuñjati.* This must mean in the order in which they are given.

[3] *VA.* 819, "I do not require your meal."

[4] *Cf.* Pāc. XXXII. **9**, 3.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that [78] time a woman lay-follower, the mother of Kāṇā,[1] had faith and was virtuous. Kāṇā[2] came to be given[3] to a certain man in a village. Then Kāṇā went to her mother's house on some business or other. Then Kāṇā's husband sent a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā come back, I desire Kāṇā's return." Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed,"[4] cooked a cake.[5] When the cake was cooked, a certain monk walking for alms came up to the dwelling of the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother. Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, gave the cake to that monk. He, having gone away, told another, and she gave him a cake. He, having gone away, told another, and she gave him a cake.[6] As soon as a cake was

---

[1] Kāṇamātā. The Babbu-jātaka was told on account of Kāṇamātā. The Introduction to this Jātaka (*Jā.* i. 477) differs somewhat from the above account, and also says that Kāṇamātā was a stream-attainer (as does *VA.* 819) and a disciple of the noble ones. Different version again at *DhA.* ii. 149 ff. (on *Dhp.* 82). Kāṇamātā and Kāṇā mentioned only in this Jātaka, Pāc. XXXIV and *DhA.*

[2] She was so beautiful that when people saw her they became blind (*kāṇa*) through passion, blinded (*andha*) with passion, so she was called *Kāṇā* because she caused blindness in others, *VA.* 819.

[3] *I.e.*, in marriage.

[4] *kismiṃ viya rittahatthaṃ gantuṃ. Cf. Jā.* i. 477, *kathaṃ tucchahatthā va gamissasi*; and see above, p. 43, "it is awkward to go out with (only) one piece of cloth," *kismiṃ viya ekasāṭakaṃ gantuṃ*, with n. 4. *VA.* 819 explains by *kīdisaṃ viya, lajjanakaṃ viya hoti*, it is like that, it is like causing shame.

[5] *pūva. Vin. Texts* i. 39, "sweetmeats," which it was "the custom to send as presents from one house to another" (*loc. cit.*, n. 1).

[6] Possibly a fourth monk came and was given a cake, although the sentence is omitted. In the next paragraph four monks went to the caravan for alms, and in the Babbu-jātaka four cats make the mouse give them food. Kāṇamātā is said to have been the mouse, and the four monks the cats.

ready it disappeared.[1] A second time did Kāṇā's husband send a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā come back, I desire Kāṇā's return." A second time did the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed" . . it disappeared. A third time did Kāṇā's husband send a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā come back, I desire Kāṇā's return. If Kāṇā does not come back, I will take[2] another wife." A third time did the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed" . . . it disappeared. Then Kāṇā's husband procured another wife. Kāṇā heard: "It is said that another wife is taken by this man." She stood weeping. Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, came up to the dwelling of that woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, approached the lord, and having approached and greeted the lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother:

"Why does this Kāṇā weep?"

Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, having . . . gladdened the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, with talk on dhamma, rising up from his seat, departed. || 1 ||

Now at that time a certain caravan was desirous of going from Rājagaha to the south.[3] A certain monk, walking for alms-food, entered that caravan for alms-food. A certain lay-follower had barley-meal[4] given to

[1] *VA.* 819: As she was a disciple of the noble ones, when she saw monks she was unable not to give, thus as soon as she gave everything disappeared.

[2] *āneti*, lead back.

[3] *paṭi-y-āloka.* Same phrase occurs at *Vin.* iv. 131; *VA.* 868 supports above rendering.

[4] *sattu.* In the rule this seems to be replaced by *mantha.* See also *Old Comy.* below, p. 324. At *Vin.* ii. 116 monks are allowed to fill needle-cases with *satthu* [*sic*] to prevent the needles from

that monk. He, having gone away, told another, and he had barley-meal given to him. He, having gone away, told another, and he had barley-meal given to him. He, having gone away, told another, and he had barley-meal given to him. As soon as provisions for the journey were ready, they disappeared. [**79**] Then that lay-follower said to these people:

"Masters, wait until tomorrow. As soon as provisions for the journey are ready, they are given to the masters. I will prepare provisions for the journey."

Saying: "Master, we are unable to wait, the caravan is setting out," they went away. Then as that lay-follower, having prepared provisions for the journey, was going along last, thieves robbed (him). People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, accept (provisions)? This (man) having given to them, going along last, was robbed by thieves."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Because of this, monks, I will make known a rule of training for monks, founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order . . . for following the rules of restraint.[1] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If a monk, going up to a family, (who) asking, should invite[2] him (to take) cakes or barley-gruel,[3] two or three

---

becoming blunt. At *Dhs.* 646 *sattu* appears in a list of foods, while at *Jā.* iii. 343 a wife prepares a bag of baked and unbaked *sattu* (*v.l. satthu*) for her husband. *VA.* 820: whatever is kneaded (or baked) *sattu*, unkneaded (or unbaked) *sattu*, sesamum seed and rice-grain, all here are called *mantha*. *VA.* 823 defines *sattu* as *sāḷivīhiyavehi katasattu*—*i.e.*, *sattu* made with rices and barley, see below, p. 330.

[1] *Cf.* *B.D.* i. 37, and above, p. 87.

[2] *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*. See above, p. 51, n. 1.

[3] *mantha*. Combined with *madhupiṇḍika*, honey-ball, at *Vin.* i. 4. See above, p. 322, n. 4.

bowlfuls may be accepted by a monk desiring them. Should he accept more than that, there is an offence of expiation. Having accepted two or three bowlfuls, having taken them back[1] from there, they must be shared together with the monks. This is the proper course in this case." ||2||**1**||

If a monk, going up to a family means: a family means: there are four (kinds of) family: noble family, brahmin family, merchant family, low-class family.[2]

Going up to means: going there.

A cake means: whatever is prepared as a present.[3]

Barley-gruel means: whatever is prepared as provisions for a journey.

Asking, should invite means: they say, 'take just as much as you want.'

Desiring means: wanting.

Two or three[4] *bowlfuls may be accepted* means: two or three[4] bowlfuls may be accepted.

Should he accept more than that means: if he accepts more than that, there is an offence of expiation.

Having accepted two or three bowlfuls, while taking them back from there, seeing a monk, he should be told: 'Two or three bowlfuls were accepted by me in such and such a place, so do not accept (anything) there.' If, seeing (him), he does not tell (him), there is an offence of wrong-doing.[5] If, although told, he accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing. [**80**]

Having taken them back from there, they must be shared

---

[1] *I.e.*, to the monastery.

[2] =*Vin.* iii. 184; iv. 177, 272.

[3] *pahiṇaka. VA.* 819 explains by *paṇṇâkāra,* a donation, present, gift.

[4] *dvitti . . . dve tayo.*

[5] There was a case in Colombo not long ago where monks visited for alms-food the hut of some very humble people, who that very day had managed to collect for themselves a rather less scanty meal than usual. The monks did not tell others that they had called here; and it happened that others followed them, so the people had to give away all the food they had. The matter was looked into by the Order and the monks' attention drawn to this Pācittiya.

together with the monks means: returning, having taken them back,[1] they must be shared.

This is the proper course in this case means: this is the appropriate course[2] in this case. || 1 ||

If he thinks that there are more when there are more than two or three bowlfuls, (and) accepts, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether there are more than . . . If he thinks that there are less when there are more than two or three bowlfuls, (and) accepts, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that there are more when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there are less when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he accepts two or three bowlfuls; if he accepts less than two or three bowlfuls; if they give what is prepared neither as a present nor as provisions for a journey; if they give the remainder of what is prepared either as a present or as provisions for a journey; if they give because the journey is given up[3]; if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if they are for the good of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 2 ||

The Fourth

---

[1] *paṭikkamanaṃ nīharitvā*. *VA*. 820 says that if two or three bowlfuls are taken, putting one aside for himself, one or two respectively should be given to the Order. *Cf. paṭikkamanasālā* at *SnA*. 53. *VA*. 820 says, *āsanasālaṃ gacchantena ca chaḍḍitasālā na gantabbaṃ yattha hi bhikkhusaṁgho nisīdati tattha gantabbaṃ*—that is, the monk must go there where the Order is sitting down, to a hall with seats.

[2] *anudhammatā* ; *cf*. above, p. 69.

[3] *gamane paṭippassaddhe*. *VA*. 820 says, "seeing an accident on the road, or not wanting (to travel), they say, 'We will not set forth, we will not go,'" thus the journey is *paṭippassaddhe, upacchinne*, broken off, interrupted.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, a certain brahmin, having invited the monks, gave them a meal. The monks, having eaten,[1] being satisfied,[2] went to relations and families, and some ate, some went out taking the alms-bowl. Then that brahmin spoke thus to the neighbours[3]:

"Masters, the monks were satisfied[4] by me; come and I will satisfy you." These said:

"How will you, master, satisfy us? For those invited by you came to our houses, some ate, others went out taking the alms-bowl."

Then that brahmin looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered sirs, having eaten in our house, eat elsewhere?[5] Yet am I not competent to give as much as they please?"[6]

Monks heard that brahmin who . . . spread it about.

---

[1] *bhuttāvin.*

[2] *pavāritā. Pavāreti* in conjunction with *bhuttāvin* seems in *Vin.* o mean "to offer, to invite," also "to satisfy," as in *P.E.D. Vin. Texts* i. 39, ii. 74, 76, 118 use "to offer" or "invite." *VA.* 821 says that the brahmin told the monks to take as much as they wanted, but they asked for only a little. Lower down there is another verb, *santappati,* meaning to satisfy, just as *nimanteti* means "to invite." Doubtless the notion of offering implied satisfying, and here "refusing" on the part of the monk. *VA.* 821 says, "the offer made, the refusal made," which probably means, as *Vin. Texts* i. 39 suggests, that the monk, though he has finished his meal, is still invited to continue eating—but refuses to do so. *Cf. abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya* at p. 51 above. At *Miln.* 266 one of the offences into which an arahan may fall is said to be that of thinking food was not offered when it was offered.

[3] *paṭivissake. Cf. M.* i. 126.

[4] *santappitā.*

[5] *Cf. B.D.* i. 110, and above, p. 317.

[6] *Cf.* above, p. 317.

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, having eaten, being satisfied, eat elsewhere?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . ate elsewhere?" .

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can these foolish men, [81] having eaten, being satisfied, eat elsewhere? Monks, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food,[1] there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

Now at that time monks brought back sumptuous alms-food for ill monks.[2] The ill monks did not eat as much as expected, (and) the monks threw these away.[3] The lord heard a loud noise, a great noise, a noise (like) the cawing of crows,[4] and hearing this he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

"What, Ānanda, is this loud noise, this great noise, this noise (like) the cawing of crows?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord.

"But, Ānanda, monks should eat what is left over by ill (monks).[5]"

"They would not eat it, lord."

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection,

---

[1] The two terms for eating, *khādeyya* and *bhuñjeyya*, correspond to the two classes of food, *khādaniya*, solid food, and *bhojaniya*, soft food. *Vin. Texts* i. 39, n. 5, gives some account of what these comprise, and see *Old Comy.* below.

[2] At *Vin.* i. 293 the monk who tends the sick, *bhikkhu gilānu-paṭṭhāko*, is the one who brings back food for him.

[3] *chaḍḍenti*, or rejected them, *tāni*.

[4] = *Vin.* i. 239. The last of these three noises is *kākoravasadda*.

[5] *gilānâtiritta*.

having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to eat what is left over[1] both by one who is ill and by one who is not ill. And, monks, (what is left over) should be made left over,[2] saying, 'All this is enough.'[3] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food that is not left over,[4] there is an offence of expiation." ||2||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Having eaten means: any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals,[5] and even (as little as) becomes eaten with a blade of grass.[6]

Being satisfied means: eating is to be seen,[7] a meal is

---

[1] *atiritta.* *Cf. Miln.* 266, where one of the offences into which an arahan may fall is said to be that of thinking food is left over when it is not left over.

[2] *atirittaṃ kātabbaṃ.*

[3] *alaṃ etaṃ sabbaṃ*, spoken by the ill monk. If he is too ill to speak, he makes a sign.

[4] *anatiritta.* Exceptions are made to this rule at *Vin.* i. 213, 214, 215 in times of scarcity. But at *Vin.* i. 238, the time of scarcity having passed, the exception does not stand, and the monk is to be dealt with according to rule—*i.e.*, to this Pāc. XXXV. Referred to also at *Vism.* 69. In the account of the Council of Vesāli (Cūḷavagga XII) it is affirmed that *gāmantarakappa*—*i.e.* (as explained at *Vin.* ii. 300), going amidst villages, having eaten, being satisfied—it is not allowable to eat food that is left over because (*Vin.* ii. 306) it violates a pācittiya rule. It is also affirmed that *amathitakappa*—*i.e.* (as explained at *Vin.* ii. 301), having eaten, being satisfied—it is not allowable to drink milk that is left over, because it violates a pācittiya rule (*Vin.* ii. 307).

[5] Those mentioned below, p. 330.

[6] *Cf.* below, p. 100.

[7] *asanaṃ paññāyati.* *Vin. Texts* i. 39, n. 2, reads *āsanaṃ*, and translates tentatively, "a seat for him is there." *VA.* 821 says, "a meal left unfinished means 'he is satisfied' . . . it is to be seen (*dissati*)."

to be seen, standing within a reach of the hand,[1] he asks[2] (him), a refusal is to be seen.[3]

What is not left over[4] means: it becomes made not allowable[5]; it becomes made not formally accepted[6]; it becomes made not delivered[7]; it becomes made not within a reach of the hand[8]; it becomes made by one who has not eaten[9]; it becomes made by one who has eaten, has been satisfied (and) has risen from his seat; it does not come to be said, 'All this is enough'; it does not come to be left over by one who is ill: this means *what is not left over.*[10]

What is left over means: it becomes made allowable; it becomes made formally accepted; it becomes made being delivered; it becomes made within a reach of the hand; it becomes made by one who has eaten; it becomes made by one who has eaten, has been satisfied (and) has

[1] *hatthapāse ṭhito. VA.* 821, "if, taking enough of the meal offered, the donor comes to be in a place distant two and a half cubits (from him)"; *cf.* above, p. 200, n. 1.

[2] *abhiharati—i.e.*, the donor or benefactor, *dāyaka*, offers him food with a gesture. Bu. at *VA.* 821, 825 takes "standing within a reach of the hand" and "he asks (him)" as separate items, while at *VA.* 822 he says that in five ways is an offer or invitation, *pavāraṇā*, to be seen (or is apparent, visible), and then he enumerates the five occurring in this paragraph.

[3] *paṭikkhepo paññāyati.* The monk refuses what was offered by a gesture or by voice. This is called "being satisfied" according to the fifth of the ways given at *VA.* 822. See preceding note, and also p. 326, n. 2.

[4] *anatiritta—i.e.*, if the following means have not been carried out.

[5] *akappiyakataṃ hoti. Kata* in this and the following phrases is comparable in meaning to the *atirittaṃ kātabbaṃ* above.

[6] *appaṭiggahitakataṃ hoti—i.e.*, by the monk (*VA.* 829).

[7] *anuccāritakataṃ hoti. VA.* 829 says *kappiyaṃ kārāpetuṃ āgatena bhikkhunā īsakaṃ pi anukkhittaṃ vā anapanāmitaṃ vā kataṃ.*

[8] *VA.* 829, to make it allowable is done by standing beyond the reach of the hand of one coming in.

[9] *abhuttāvinā kataṃ hoti. VA.* 829 says that whoever saying, 'This is enough,' makes it left over, it is made (allowable) by one who has not eaten (though) a sufficient meal was offered.

[10] *VA.* 829 says, by the seven Vinaya acts that which is left over is not made allowable, rather than that not left over by an ill monk; but both should be called 'not left over.'

not risen from his seat; it comes to be said, 'All this is enough'; it comes to be left over by one who is ill: this means *what is left over*. [82]

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, and food (that may be eaten) during a watch of the night,[1] during seven days,[2] during life,[3] the rest means *solid food*.

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice,[4] food made with flour,[5] barley-meal,[6] fish, meat. If he accepts, thinking, 'I will eat, I will partake of,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

---

[1] *yāmakālika*. *P.E.D.* gives "of a restricted time . . . (lit.) only for one watch of the night." *Vin. Texts* ii. 144 render, "till the first watch of the night," but had "first" been specially meant surely *paṭhamayāma* would have been used. *VA.* 839 (on Pāc. XXXVIII) says this term means "until the last watch of the night." *Vin. Texts* ii. 144 also states that *yāmakālika* "refers to certain medicines; see Mahāvagga VI. **1,** 5." These five standard medicines apparently could be eaten at night, since they did not count as ordinary forms of nutriment (*na ca oḷāriko āhāro paññāyati*), *Vin.* i. 199. The relations of *yāmakālika* and the next two: *sattâhakālika*, *yāvajīvika*, are discussed at *Vin.* i. 251 with the addition of *yāvakālika*, temporary (shorter than *yāmakālika*).

[2] *sattâhakālika*. *Vin. Texts* ii. 144 states that "this also refers to certain medicines; see the 23rd Nissaggiya." These medicines are the same as those referred to at Mahāvagga VI. **1,** 5=VI. **1,** 2 (*Vin.* i. 199).

[3] *yāvajīvika*. *Vin. Texts* ii. 144, n. 4, says, "what this refers to is unknown to us." I think it may refer to the different kinds of roots and other things allowed as medicines, and which could be stored up for life, *yāvajīvam*, *Vin.* i. 201. *VA.* 833, quoting this *Vin.* passage (i. 201), says that these roots are called in the text *yāvajīvikaṃ*. They apparently did not deteriorate with keeping, and so could be kept during a life-time.

[4] *odana*. *VA.* 822 says *odana* is *sāḷi* (rice), *vīhi* (paddy, rice), *yava* (corn, barley), *godhūma* (wheat), *kaṅgu* (millet), *varaka* (a bean), *kudrūsaka* (perhaps rye, see *Dial.* iii. 70, n. 1)—*i.e.*, the seven kinds of grain, *dhañña*. At *Vin.* iv. 264 these seven appear in definition of *āmakadhañña*, grain in its raw, uncooked state. *Cf. DA.* 78, *B.D.* i. 83, n. 4. *VA.* 822 defines all these grains.

[5] *kummāsa*. *VA.* 823 says that it is *yavehi katakummāso*, a junket made with barley; see *yava* in previous note.

[6] *sattu*, see above, p. 322, n. 4.

If he thinks that it is not left over when it is not left over (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not left over . . . If he thinks that it is left over when it is not left over . . . an offence of expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not left over when it is left over, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is left over, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is left over when it is left over, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence[1] if, having caused it to be made left over, he eats; if, having caused it to be made left over, he accepts it, thinking: " I will eat "; if he goes away, conveying it for the sake of another; if he eats the remainder of an ill (monk's meal); if, when there is a reason,[2] he makes use of (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Fifth

[1] *Cf.* Pāc. XXXVI below, p. 334.
[2] *sati paccaye*. *VA*. 831 says that if he is thirsty and makes use of the food to be eaten during the periods mentioned above, for the sake of slaking his thirst, or if he has a pain that could be eased, and uses these foods for that purpose, there is no offence.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXVI

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time two monks were travelling to Sāvatthī along a high-road in the Kosalan districts. One monk indulged in bad habits; the second monk said to this monk: "Your reverence, do not do that, it is not allowable." He grumbled at him.[1] Then these monks arrived at Sāvatthī. Now at that time food for the Order was (prepared) by a certain guild[2] in Sāvatthī. The second monk, having eaten, came to be satisfied. The monk who grumbled,[3] having gone to his relations, taking alms-food, approached that monk, and having approached he said to that monk:

"Do eat, your reverence."

"No need, I am full, your reverence."

"Your reverence, the alms-food is delicious, do eat."

Then this monk, being pressed by that monk, ate that alms-food. The monk who grumbled [**83**] said to that monk:

"Your reverence, you think that I should be advised (by you), when you, having eaten, being satisfied, eat soft food that is not left over?"

"Your reverence, should it not be spoken about?"

"Your reverence, should it not be inquired into?"

Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk, asking a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied, invite him (to take) soft food that is not left over?"

---

[1] To here=*Vin.* ii. 118, but where the story proceeds to a tragic ending. [2] *Cf.* above, p. 160.

[3] *upanandha bhikkhu,* expl. by *janita-upanāha,* produced a grudge, ill-will, *VA.* 831.

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, asking a monk . . . soft food that is not left over?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, asking a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied, invite him (to take) soft food that is not left over? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, asking[1] a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied, should invite him (to take) solid food or soft food that is not left over, saying: 'Now, monk, eat or partake of,'[2] knowing,[3] desiring to find fault with,[4] in the eating there is an offence of expiation."
|| **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Having eaten means: . . . (see Pāc. XXXV. **3**) . . . this means *what is not left over.*

Solid food means: . . . (see Pāc. XXXV. **3**) . . . meat.

Asking, should invite[5] means: he says, "Take just as much as you want."

He knows[6] means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or he[7] tells him.

Desiring to find fault with means: if he asks (him), saying: 'I will reprove him for this, I will remind him, I will blame him, I will make him think back, I will shame[8] him,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at his bidding, he accepts, saying: 'I will eat, I will par-

[1] Above, pp. 51, 323.

[2] Above, p. 327.

[3] *I.e.*, knowing by means of one of the three ways of knowing (see *Old Comy.*) that that monk is satisfied.

[4] *āsādanâpekkho. VA.* 831, desiring to arouse insult, rebuke, shame.

[5] Above, pp. 51, 324.

[6] Above, pp. 161, 297.

[7] *I.e.*, that monk.

[8] *maṅkuṃ karoti, cf.* above, p. 178.

take of,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. At the end of the meal there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he was satisfied when he was satisfied (and), asking him, invites him (to take) solid food or soft food that is not left over, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he was satisfied . . . offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was not satisfied when he was satisfied . . . is no offence.[1] If he asks him (to take) for the sake of nourishment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at his bidding, he accepts, saying: 'I will eat, I will partake of,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was satisfied when he was not satisfied, [84] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he was not satisfied, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was not satisfied when he was not satisfied, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence[2] if, having caused it to be made left over, he gives it; if, having caused it to be made left over, he gives it, saying, "Eat"; if he gives it, saying: "Go away, conveying it for the sake of another"; if he gives the remainder of an ill (monk's meal); if, when there is a reason, he gives (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, saying, "Make use of it"; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Sixth

[1] *v.l. āpatti dukkaṭassa*, see *Vin*. iv. 360.
[2] *Cf*. Pāc. XXXV, above, p. 331.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXVII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time, in Rājagaha there came to be a festival on a mountain-top.[1] The group of seventeen monks went to see the festival on the mountain-top. People, seeing the group of seventeen monks, having bathed, having anointed themselves, having offered (them) (food), gave solid food. The group of seventeen monks, taking the solid food, having gone to the monastery, said to the group of six monks:

" Take, your reverences, eat solid food."

" Where did your reverences obtain solid food?" they said.

The group of seventeen monks told this matter to the group of six monks.

" Then do you, your reverences, eat a meal at the wrong time?"[2]

" Yes, your reverences."

The group of six monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

" How can the group of seventeen monks eat a meal at the wrong time?" Then this group of six monks told

---

[1] *giraggasamajja*. See on *samajja* interesting n. 4 at *Dial.* i. 7, also *Vin. Texts* iii. 71. At *Vin.* ii. 107-108 the group of six monks went to see such a festival, at which there was singing, dancing, music: made a dukkaṭa offence. At *Vin.* iv. 267, when the group of six monks went, the offence incurred is a pācittiya. Word occurs again at *Vin.* ii. 150. In *Vin.* the festival seems always to have been held on a mountain near Rājagaha. *Cf.* *Jā.* iii. 538, where it is mentioned as being held all over Jambudīpa. *VA.* 831 says that *samajja* (festival) is a high place on a mountain or a high festival on a mountain. Also that it was announced seven days beforehand, and held on level ground in the shadow of a mountain slope outside a city. See also *D.P.P.N.* *Samajja* mentioned alone at *Jā.* i. 394, iii. 541.

[2] *vikāle*. *Cf.* Pāc. LXXXV.

this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of seventeen monks eat a meal at the wrong time?" These monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, ate a meal at the wrong time?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, eat a meal at the wrong time? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should eat or partake of solid food[1] or soft food at the wrong time,[2] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** || **[85]**

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

The wrong time means: after noon has passed until sunrise.[3]

---

[1] Bu. at *VA.* 832 ff. enumerates various kinds of solid food under the following categories: roots, tubers, roots of lotuses, top sprouts, leaves, flowers, stones of fruits, eatables made from flour (*piṭṭhakhādaniya*, *cf. Vin.* i. 248, 249, where this was allowed to monks), resins.

[2] *vikāle*, see *Old Comy.* just below. At *Vin.* i. 200 the five medicines are allowed to be used at the right time and at the wrong time. *Ibid.*, regulations laid down for receiving, cooking, mixing fat at the right time and at the wrong time. At *Miln.* 266 it is said that a meal at the wrong time is not a sin in the eyes of the world, but in the Jina's teaching. The account of the Council of Vesālī (*Vin.* ii. 294 ff.) affirms that the *dvaṅgula-kappa* (*i.e.*, when the shadow has turned by two finger-breadths, *Vin.* ii. 300) is not allowable, because it violates the *vikālabhojana pācittiya*—*i.e.*, eating at the wrong time.

See the vivid description attributed to Udāyin, at *M.* i. 448 f., of his feelings at the successive injunctions for monks to give up day and evening meals, and his ultimate conviction of the lord's wisdom in stopping alms-giving in the dark of the night. *Cf.* also *M.* i. 124, 473; and *M.* i. 437, where Bhaddāli confessed that he had not been able to keep to the regimen of one meal a day.

[3] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 166.

Solid food means: . . . *soft food* means: . . . meat. If he accepts it, thinking: " I will eat, I will partake of," there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the wrong time (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the wrong time . . . If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the wrong time . . . offence of expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nourishment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the right time, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence[1] if, when there is a reason, he makes use of (food) to be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Seventh

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 331, 334.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa,[1] the preceptor of the venerable Ānanda, was staying in the jungle. He, having walked for alms-food, having conveyed boiled rice[2] to the monastery, having had it dried, laid it aside; when he came to need it for food, then moistening it with water, he ate it; after a long time he entered the village for alms-food. Monks spoke thus to the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa: "How is it that you, your reverence, after a long time enter the village for alms-food?" Then the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa told this matter to the monks. They said:

"But do you, your reverence, eat a meal that was stored[3]?"

"Yes, your reverences." Those who were modest monks . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Belaṭṭhasīsa, ate a meal that was stored?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, Belaṭṭhasīsa, eat a meal that was stored? It is not, Belaṭṭhasīsa, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: [**86**]

Whatever monk should eat or partake of solid food

---

[1] *VA.* 838 says he was the prominent great thera of the thousand *jaṭilas*, or matted hair ascetics. His verses given at *Thag.* 16. In *Comy.* on this (see *Pss. Breth.*, p. 21) it is said that with these ascetics he was tamed by Gotama, and attained arahanship after the Utterance on Burning (*Vin.* i. 35). He suffered from eczema, *Vin.* i. 202, 295.

[2] *sukkhakūra*; *VA.* 838 calls it *asūpabyañjana odana*, boiled rice without the curry and sauce.

[3] *sannidhikāraka bhojana.*

or soft food that was stored,[1] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Stored means: accepted today, it becomes eaten the next day.

Solid food means: . . . *soft food* means: . . . meat. If he accepts it, saying, " I will eat, I will partake of," there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is stored when it is stored (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is stored . . . If he thinks that it is not stored when it is stored . . . expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment food (to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is stored when it is not stored, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not stored, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not stored when it is not stored, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, having stored[2] (food) for the time being,[3] he eats it in that time; if, having stored (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, he eats

---

[1] *Cf.* rules against storing up medicines for more than seven days at *Vin.* i. 209, iii. 251. It is said that an arahan cannot become one to use for sensual pleasure what is stored up, *D.* iii. 235=*M.* i. 523=*A.* iv. 370. *Cf.* also *sannidhikāra* at *D.* i. 6.

In the Cūḷavagga account of the Council of Vesālī, *Vin.* ii. 294 ff., it is called not allowable to carry about salt in a horn, so as to put salt on to what is not salted (*Vin.* ii. 300), as by so doing the " sannidhikārakabhojana pācittiya " would be infringed (*Vin.* ii. 306).

[2] *nidahitvā*, or hoarding.

[3] *yāvakālika*. *VA.* 839, it may be eaten until noon. *Cf.* above, p. 330, n. 1.

it in a watch of the night[1]; if, having stored (food) to be eaten during seven days, he eats it in seven days; if, when there is a reason, he uses (food to be eaten) during life[2]; if he is mad; if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Eighth

[1] *VA*. 839, it may be eaten until the last watch of the night.
[2] *Cf. Vin.* i. 251 on relations of right and wrong times for eating these foods.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XXXIX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having asked for sumptuous foods[1] for themselves,[2] ate them. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having asked for sumptuous foods for themselves, eat them? Who is not fond of well-cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?"[3] Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, having asked for . . . eat them?" [87] . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having asked for . . . ate them?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, having asked for . . . eat them? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever are sumptuous foods, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses,[4] fish, meat, milk, curds —whatever monk, having asked for sumptuous foods such as these for himself, should eat them, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, enquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks:

---

[1] *paṇītabhojanāni ti uttamabhojanaṃ*, *VA*. 840.

[2] *attano atthāya*.

[3] =*Vin*. ii. 196=iv. 71.

[4] The five standard medicines.

"We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going."

"Formerly, your reverences, we, having asked for sumptuous foods for ourselves, ate them. Therefore there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, and being scrupulous, we do not ask, therefore there comes to be no comfort for us."[1]

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion,[2] having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, having asked for sumptuous foods for himself, to eat them. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever are sumptuous foods, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk, curds —whatever monk who is not ill, having asked for sumptuous foods such as these for himself, should eat them, there is an offence of expiation." || 2 ||

Whatever are sumptuous foods[3]: *ghee*[4] is called ghee from cows or ghee from she-goats or ghee from buffaloes, ghee from those whose meat is allowable.[5] *Fresh butter* means fresh butter from just these. *Oil* means sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey, oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow. *Honey* means honey of bees. *Molasses* means what is produced from sugar-cane. *Fish* means it is called one that lives in water. *Meat* means the meat of those whose meat is allowable. *Milk* means milk of cows or milk of she-goats or milk of buffaloes, milk of those whose meat is allowable. *Curds* means curds from just these. [88]

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 277; below, pp. 399, 402.

[2] *etasmiṃ pakaraṇe*, "in this connection," omitted here.

[3] *VA.* 840 says that besides these (nine)—*i.e.*, ghee and so on—sumptuous foods are also those prepared from the seven kinds of grain. *Cf. Vin. Texts* ii. 133, n. 3.

[4] From here to "sugar-cane" = *Vin.* iii. 251. See above, p. 131.

[5] Various kinds of meat which, if eaten, give rise to dukkaṭa offences are given at *Vin.* i. 218 f.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Sumptuous foods such as these means: sumptuous foods like these.

Not ill means: for whom there comes to be comfort without sumptuous foods. *Ill* means: for whom there does not come to be comfort without sumptuous foods. *Not ill, asks for himself*, for every request,[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he accepts (alms) thinking, "I will eat on acquisition," there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) having asked for sumptuous foods for himself, eats them, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ill . . . If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill . . . expiation. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he is ill; if having become ill, having asked, one who is not ill eats (the alms); if he eats the remainder of an ill (monk's meal);[2] if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if it is for the good of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Ninth

[1] *payoge payoge ;* each time he asks there is an offence.
[2] *Cf.* above, p. 331.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XL

. . . at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time a certain monk, wearing robes made entirely of rags, was staying in a cemetery. He did not want to accept gifts[1] from people. And himself taking (food) put down for the departed masters[2] in a cemetery and at the foot of a tree and on a threshold,[3] he ate it. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this monk, himself taking (food) put down for our departed masters, eat it? This monk is strong,[4] he is fat,[5] for certain he eats meat (belonging to) people."[6]

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk convey to his mouth[7] nutriment not given?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, conveyed to your mouth nutriment not given?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, convey to your mouth nutriment not given? It is not, foolish man, for

---

[1] *diyyamāna.*

[2] *ayyavosāṭitakāni.* *VA.* 842 says *ayyā* are the ancestors who have done their time (here), and *vosāṭitakatāni* are the solid and soft foods put down in cemeteries and so on for these by their relations.

[3] *ummāre; cf. Vin.* iv. 100, 160.

[4] *thero=thiro ghanabaddho, VA.* 842.

[5] *vadhara=thūla, VA.* 842, reading *vaṭhara.*

[6] Meat is a "soft food," *cf.* above, p. 330, and *bhuñjati* is the verb technically associated with it. Here we get *manussamaṃsaṃ khādati.* At *Vin.* i. 218 *manussamaṃsa* is combined with *paribhuñjati,* and certainly means human flesh.

[7] *mukhadvāra,* the door of the face.

pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: [89]

Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time monks were scrupulous in regard to water for cleansing the teeth.[1] They told this matter to the lord. He said:

" I allow you, monks, yourselves having taken water for cleansing the teeth, to partake of it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, except water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of expiation." || **2** ||

Whatever means : . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not given means : it is called not accepted.[2]

Given means: if in giving by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body[3] or by means of something that may be cast,[4] standing within a reach of the hand, if he accepts by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body,[5] this is called *given.*

Nutriment means: setting aside water for cleansing the teeth, whatever is fit to eat, this is called *nutriment.*

Except water for cleansing the teeth means: setting aside water for cleansing the teeth.

If he takes it, thinking: ' I will eat, I will partake of,'

[1] *udakadantapoṇa*, also a tooth-cleaner. *Vin. Texts* i. 40 takes this compound as " water and a tooth-cleaner."

[2] *VA.* 843 points out that in Defeat II, ' not given ' means not appropriated from others.

[3] *E.g.*, a spoon, *VA.* 843.

[4] *Cf. B.D.* i. 208.

[5] *E.g.*, a bowl, *VA.* 843.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is not accepted when it is not accepted (and) conveys to his mouth nutriment that is not given, except water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not accepted . . . . If he thinks that it is accepted when it is not accepted . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not accepted when it is accepted, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is accepted, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is accepted when it is accepted, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence in regard to water for cleansing the teeth; if himself, having taken the four foul things,[1] he makes use of them when there is a reason (and if) there is no one to make them allowable[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Tenth

This is its key:

A meal, a joint (meal), an out-of-turn (meal),[3] a cake, and two on having eaten, being satisfied,
At the wrong time, storing, milk, with water for cleansing the teeth—these ten.

The Fourth Division: that on Food [**90**]

[1] *cattāri mahāvikatāni.* These are given at *Vin.* i. 206 as remedies for a monk who was bitten by a snake. Further said that these things might be accepted *sati kappiyakārake* (if there is anyone there who, by offering a thing, makes that thing *kappiya*, allowable), but if there is no one there to offer and hence to make allowable, then a monk may take these things himself.

[2] Again, *cf. Vin.* i. 206, where it is said, *anujānāmi bhikkhave sati kappiyakārake paṭiggahāpetuṃ asati kappiyakārake sāmaṃ gahetvā paribhuñjitun ti,* I allow, monks, (these things) to be accepted if there is anyone there to make them allowable; if there is no one there to make them allowable, (I allow a monk) himself taking them, to make use of them.

[3] *paraṃ* here.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLI

. . . at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time there came to be abundant[1] solid food for the Order. Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Well, Ānanda, give the cakes[2] to those who eat scraps of food."[3]

"Very well, lord," and the venerable Ānanda, having answered the lord, having made those who eat scraps of food sit down one after the other,[4] giving a cake to each, gave two cakes to a certain female wanderer, thinking that they were one. Neighbouring female wanderers spoke thus to this female wanderer:

"This recluse is your lover."

"This recluse is not my lover; he gave two cakes, thinking that they were one."

A second time . . . A third time did the venerable Ānanda, giving a cake to each one, give two cakes, thinking that they were one, to this female wanderer. Neighbouring female wanderers spoke thus to this female wanderer: . . .

"This recluse is not my lover; he gave two cakes, thinking that they were one."

Saying, "The lover is not a lover," they quarrelled. || 1 ||

Then a certain Naked Ascetic went to a distribution of food. A certain monk, mixing cooked rice with a quantity of ghee, gave a large alms-meal to that Naked

---

[1] *ussanna*. At *Vin*. i. 285 said of robes; at Pāc. XLVII of medicines.

[2] *pūvaṃ*, or "sweetmeats," see above, p. 321.

[3] *vighāsâda*, not Sakyan monks who should not eat what is left over, see above, p. 328. Word occurs at *Jā*. i. 348, ii. 96, iii. 191.

[4] *paṭipāṭiyā*, successively, in order.

Ascetic. Then the Naked Ascetic, taking that alms-meal, went away. A certain Naked Ascetic said to that Naked Ascetic:

"Where, your reverence, was an alms-meal obtained by you?"

"It was obtained, your reverence, at a distribution of food (made) by a shaven householder[1] of that recluse Gotama."

Lay followers heard this talk of those Naked Ascetics. Then these lay followers approached the lord, and having approached, having greeted the lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these lay followers spoke thus to the lord:

"Lord, these adherents of other sects desire blame for the enlightened one, they desire blame for dhamma, they desire blame for the Order. It were well, lord, that the masters did not give to the adherents of other sects with their (own) hand(s)."

Then the lord gladdened . . . delighted these lay followers with dhamma-talk. Then these lay followers, having been gladdened . . . delighted by the lord with dhamma-talk, rising from (their) seats, having greeted the lord, departed, keeping their right sides towards him. Then the lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks, founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order, [**91**] for the comfort of the Order . . . for establishing what is dhamma indeed, for following the rules of restraint.[2] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should give with his own hand solid food or soft food to a naked ascetic[3] or to a wanderer or to a female wanderer, there is an offence of expiation."

|| 2 || **1** ||

---

[1] *muṇḍagahapatika,* clearly a term of disparagement. It may be in apposition to "that recluse Gotama."

[2] =*Vin.* iii. 21 (*B.D.* i. 37 f.).

[3] Here *acelaka,* previously *ājīvaka.* See Intr., p. xlii., n. 2.

Whatever means : . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Naked ascetic[1] means: whoever being naked has reached (the stage of) a wanderer.[2]

Wanderer means : setting aside monk and novice, whoever has reached (the stage of) a wanderer.[3]

Female wanderer means : setting aside nun and female probationer and female novice, whoever has reached (the stage of) a female wanderer.[3]

Solid food means : setting aside the five (kinds of) meals (and) water for cleansing the teeth, what remains is called solid food.

Soft food means : the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice, food made with flour, barley-meal, fish, meat.[4]

Should give means: if he gives by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body or by means of something that may be cast, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is an adherent of another sect when he is an adherent of another sect, (and) gives with his (own) hand solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is an adherent of another sect . . . If he thinks that he is not an adherent of another sect when he is an adherent of another sect . . . of expiation. If he gives water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is an adherent of another sect when he is not an adherent of another sect, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not an adherent of another sect, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not an adherent of another sect when he is not an adherent of another sect, there is no offence. || 2 ||

---

[1] Here *acelaka*, previously *ājīvaka*. See Intr., p. xlii., n. 2.
[2] *paribbājakasamāpanna*. This definition = *Vin.* iv. 285.
[3] = *Vin.* iv. 285. [4] = *Vin.* iv. 83.

There is no offence if he gets someone to give,[1] (but) does not (himself) give; if he gives depositing (it) near[2]; if he gives ointment for external (use)[3]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[4] || 3 || **2** ||

The First

[1] *dāpeti*—*e.g.*, one who is not ordained—*VA.* 855.

[2] *I.e.*, not giving "with his own hand," but putting food on the ground or in his bowl, and inviting the recipient to take from there.

[3] *bāhirālepaṃ;* offences are incurred by giving a member of another sect things to eat or drink, even water for washing the teeth. *Ālepa* occurs at *Vin.* i. 274.

[4] =*Vin.* iv. 303.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, spoke thus to a monk, who shared (his) brother's cell:

"Come, your reverence, we will enter the village for alms-food." Without having had (alms-food) given to him, he dismissed him, saying: "Go away, your reverence. Neither talking nor sitting down with you comes to be a comfort for me; [92] either talking or sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me."

Then that monk, when the meal-time was near, was not able to walk for alms, and returning he did not achieve participation in the meal; he became famished.[1] Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying to a monk, 'Come, your reverence, we will go into the village for alms-food,' without having had (alms-food) given to him, dismiss him . . . ?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, saying to a monk, 'Come . . .' dismiss him? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, saying to a monk, 'Come, your reverence, we will go into a village or little town[2] for alms-food,' either causing to be given or not causing to be given (alms-food) to him, should dismiss him, saying, 'Go away, your reverence, neither talking nor sitting down with you comes to be a comfort for me; either

[1] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 70, 175.

[2] *nigama*; *cf.* above, p. 63, n. 2.

talking or sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me '—if doing it for just this object, not for another,[1] there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Come, your reverence, to a village or little town means: a village and a little town and a town, a village as well as little town.

Causing to be given (alms-food) to him means: causing conjey or solid food or soft food to be given.

Not causing to be given means: not causing anything to be given.

Should dismiss means: if desiring to laugh, desiring to sport together with a woman, if desiring to sit down in private, if desiring to indulge in bad habits, he speaks thus: 'Go away, your reverence, neither talking . . . sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me,' (and) dismisses[2] him, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Dismissing him from sight[3] or from hearing is an offence of wrong-doing. When he is dismissed, there is an offence of expiation.

If doing it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever (for which) to dismiss him. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) dismisses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained . . . If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained, (and) dismisses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he finds fault with another,[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he dismisses one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he finds fault

[1] =above, p. 248; *Vin.* iv. 149, 150. [2] *uyyojeti.*
[3] *dassanûpacāraṃ* (lit. the precincts of sight) *vijahantassa ; cf.* below, p. 376. [4] *kalisāsanaṃ āropeti.*

with another,[1] there is an offence of wrong-doing. [**93**] If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[2] || 2 ||

There is no offence if he dismisses him, saying: 'Together we will not both keep going'[3]; if, seeing costly goods, he dismisses him, saying, 'It will produce a state of greed'[4]; if, seeing a woman, he dismisses him, saying, 'She will produce dissatisfaction'; if he dismisses him, saying, 'Take back conjey or solid food or soft food for one who is ill, or for one who is left behind,[5] or for a guardian of the dwelling-place'; if, not desiring to indulge in bad habits, he dismisses him if it ought to be done; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Second

[1] *kalisāsanaṃ āropeti.*
[2] Most probably error for "no offence."
[3] *yāpeti*, or "We will not both go together."
[4] *lobhadhamma.*
[5] *ohiyyaka*, as *e.g.* on guard at a vihāra (though this notion is covered by next word); *cf. Vin.* iii. 208.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, going to a friend's house, sat down[1] in a sleeping-room[2] together with his wife. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, having greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that man spoke thus to his wife:

"Give alms-food to the master."

Then that woman gave alms-food to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Then that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You may go, honoured sir, inasmuch as alms-food has been given to the master."

Then that woman, observing, 'This man is obsessed,'[3] spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Sit down, honoured sir, do not go away."

A second time that man . . . A third time that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You may go, honoured sir, inasmuch as alms-food has been given to the master."

---

[1] *nisajjaṃ kappeti.*

[2] *sayanighara*; a definition is given at *Vin.* iv. 160. *Cf. Vin.* i. 140.

[3] *pariyuṭṭhita. Cf. Vin.* iv. 229. Also *D.* ii. 104; *M.* i. 433-4; *Vin.* ii. 289 (where with *citta*). *VA.* 856 says *rāgapariyuṭṭhito methunâdhippayo*, obsessed (or possessed) by passion, desiring intercourse.

A third time did that woman say to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Sit down, honoured sir, do not go away."

Then that man, going out, made monks look down upon[1] (Upananda), saying:

"Honoured sirs, this master Upananda is sitting in the sleeping-room together with my wife; he, being dismissed by me, does not wish to go. We are very busy, there is much to be done."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, intruding upon[2] a family with food,[3] [**94**] sit down?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, intruding upon . . . sat down?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, intruding . . . sit down? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, intruding upon a family with food, should sit down, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

---

[1] *ujjhāpeti.* *Cf.* above, p. 235.

[2] *anupakhajja.* *Cf.* above, p. 247, and note.

[3] *sabhojane kule.* *Vin Texts* i. 41, "into a house where a meal is going on." Ed. *Vin. Texts* i. 41, n. 3, remarks that the *VA.*, doubtless to justify the *Old. Comy.'s* definition (see below) with its "suggested implication," makes *sabhojanaṃ* equal to *saha ubhohi janehi* (!); or, in the alternative, to *sabhogaṃ*, since the wife is the *bhoga* (property) "of a man still given to passion, and the husband the *bhoga* of a wife . . .; it is just possible we should translate, 'a household still given to pleasure' (*cf.* Cūḷavagga VIII. **5**, 1), or 'fond of good food' (*Miln.* 76)." Huber, *J. As.*, Nov.-Dec., 1913, p. 511, "dans une maison ou on 'mange.'" *P.E.D.* suggests very tentatively "sharing food (?)." *Sabhojana* at *Sn.* 102 means "with food." At *Vin.* ii. 216 (=*CV.* VIII. **5**, 2), a monk who has entered a dwelling for food should cover up his bowl with his robe when he has received the alms, and turn away.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Family with food means: there is a woman and also a man, and both the woman and the man are not gone out, both are not without passion.

Intruding means: forcing a way into.[1]

Should sit down means: if he sits down in a large house, having left (the space of) a reach of the hand[2] from door-posts and lintel,[3] there is an offence of expiation; if he sits down in a small house, having gone beyond the beam,[4] there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a sleeping-room when it is a sleeping-room (and), intruding upon a family with food, sits down, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a sleeping-room . . . If he thinks that it is not a sleeping-room when it is a sleeping-room . . . an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a sleeping-room when it is not a sleeping-room, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a sleeping-room, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a sleeping-room when it is not a sleeping-room, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he sits down in a large house, not having left (the space of) a reach of the hand from door-posts and lintel; if he sits down in a small house, not having gone beyond the beam; if there comes to be a second monk; if both have gone out[5]; if both are without passion; if it is not in a sleeping-room[5]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 2 ||

The Third

[1] =above, p. 248. [2] =*Vin.* iv. 269.

[3] *piṭṭhasaṁghāta.* *Cf.* above, p. 258, and *Vin.* ii. 120, and *Vin. Texts* iii. 105, n. 2.

[4] *piṭṭhivaṃsa.* *VA.* 856 says that if such a sleeping-room is among four large rooms, then *piṭṭhivaṃsaṃ atikkamitvā* means going beyond the middle (of the house), *iminā majjhâtikkamaṃ dasseti.* The word *piṭṭhivaṃsa* occurs at *DhA.* i. 52 (translated, *Bud. Legends* i. 174, as "the central rafter of the hut") and at *MA.* iii. 167.

[5] =*Vin.* iv. 161.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLIV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having gone to the house of a friend, sat down in a private place on a secluded seat together with his wife. [95] Then that man looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can master Upananda sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with my wife?"

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with a woman?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, sat down . . . with a woman?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, sit down . . . with a woman? Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with a woman, there is an offence of expiation."[1] || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Woman[2] means: a human woman, not a female

---

[1] *Cf.* the Aniyatas, *B.D.* i. 330 ff.; also Pāc. XXX (where monks are forbidden to sit down in private with a nun), and Pāc. XLV.

[2] From here to end || 1 ||, *cf.* *B.D.* i. 332.

yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a girl born this very day, much more an older one.

Together with means: together.

A private place means: private from the eye, private from the ear. Private from the eye means: if covering the eye, or raising the eyebrow, or raising the head, he is unable to see. Private from the ear means: it is impossible to hear ordinary talk.[1]

A secluded seat means: it is secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub or by a door or by a screen or by a screen-wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack or by anything whatever.

Should sit down means: if a woman is sitting and a monk comes to be sitting or lying down close (to her), there is an offence of expiation; if a monk is sitting and a woman comes to be sitting or lying down close (to him), there is an offence of expiation. Or if both are sitting or if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is a woman[2] when it is a woman (and) sits down in a private place on a secluded seat, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman . . . If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman . . . offence of expiation. If he sits down in a private place on a secluded seat with a female yakkha or with a female departed one or with a eunuch or with an animal in woman's form, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, [**96**] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if he stands, does not sit; if he is not desirous

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 301.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 202, 206.

of a private place; if he sits down thinking about something else; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[1] || 3 || **2** ||

The Fourth

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 301, and *Vin.* iv. 269.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having gone to the house of a friend, sat down in a private place together with his wife, the one with the other. Then that man . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can master Upananda sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other?"

Monks heard this man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, sat down . . the one with the other?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, sit down . . . the one with the other? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation."[1] || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female yakkha, not a female departed one, not a female animal, one who is learned, competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* the Aniyatas, *B.D.* i. 330 ff., and Pāc. XXX, XLIV, above.
[2] =*B.D.* i. 215 f., 337.

Together with means: together.[1]

The one with the other means: there is a monk and also a woman.[2]

A private place means: . . . private from the eye . . . ordinary talk.[3]

Should sit down means: . . . (see Pāc. XLIV. **2**, 1. *Instead of* in a private place on a secluded seat *read* in a private place, the one with the other) . . . if he is the first wrong-doer. || **2** ||

The Fifth [**97**]

---

[1] =*B.D.* i. 332, 337; and above, pp. 301, 358.

[2] =*B.D.* i. 332.

[3] =*B.D.* i. 332, and above, pp. 301, 358.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLVI

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, invited the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to a meal, and they invited other monks to the meal. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, used to visit[1] families before the meal. Then these monks said to these people:

"Sirs, give the meal."

"Wait, honoured sirs, until master Upananda comes."

A second time these monks . . . A third time these monks said to these people:

"Sirs, give the meal before the right time passes."[2]

A third time they said:

"Honoured sirs, we made the meal on account of master Upananda. Wait, honoured sirs, until master Upananda comes."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having visited families before the meal, returned during the day. The monks did not eat as much as expected. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, call upon[3] families before the meal?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, called upon families before the meal?"

---

[1] *payirupāsati*, or wait upon. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 157, most likely meaning there "to pay homage to"; and for whole of this passage *cf. Vin.* i. 213 f.

[2] By Pāc. XXXVII monks were not allowed to eat at the wrong time—*i.e.*, after mid-day.

[3] *cārittaṃ āpajjati.*

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, being invited . . . before the meal? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before the meal, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent solid food for the Order, saying:

"Pointing it out as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order." Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, had entered the village for alms-food. Then these people, having gone to the monastery, asked the monks: "Where, honoured sirs, is master Upananda?" [98]

"Sirs, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, has entered the village for alms-food."

"Honoured sirs, pointing out this solid food as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order."

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, having accepted it, put it aside until Upananda comes back."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, thinking, "It is forbidden by the lord to call upon families before a meal," having visited families after a meal, returned during the day.[1] The solid food was

---

[1] *I.e.*, for the later part of it, after the meal-time. To here from beginning of this par. *cf. Vin.* i. 213 f., but this passage continues differently, ending in an exception to Pāc. XXXV.

left over.[1] Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, call on families after a meal?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, called on families after a meal?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, call on families after a meal? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 ||

Now at that time scrupulous monks,[2] at the time of giving robes, did not visit families; little robe-material accrued. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at the time of giving robes, to visit families. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: the time of giving robes; this is the right time in this case."[3]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 3 ||

Now at that time monks[4] were making robes and they came to be in need of needles and thread and

---

[1] *khādaniyaṃ ussādiyittha.* *Cf.* *ussādiyiṃsu* at *Vin.* ii. 167, and *Vin. Texts* iii. 202, n. 4.

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 307, 318.

[3] At *Vin.* i. 254 one of the five things allowed to monks after the kaṭhina-cloth has been made is going to houses of people who have not invited them.

[4] *Cf.* above, pp. 308, 318.

scissors. The monks, being scrupulous, did not visit families. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at the time of making robes, to visit families. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: [99]

Whatever monk, being invited and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: the time of giving robes, the time of making robes; this is the right time in this case."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **4** ||

Now at that time monks became ill and came to be in need of medicines. The monks, being scrupulous, did not visit families. . . .

"I allow you, monks, to visit families, having asked (for permission) if a monk be there.[1] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, being invited and being (provided) with a meal, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is the time of giving robes, the time of making robes[2]; this is the right time in this case." || **5** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] *santaṃ bhikkhuṃ āpucchā*. *Cf*. *Vin*. iv. 165, where, in Pāc. LXXXV, *āpucchā* and *anāpucchā* occur first without the phrase *santaṃ bhikkhuṃ* and then with it. *Vin*. *Texts* i. 42 has "without having previously spoken about it to a Bhikkhu, if there is one there," and *ibid*. 53 has "without having informed a Bhikkhu if one is present." *Cf*. also *anāpucchā* in Pāc. XIV, *Vin*. iv. 39, translated at *Vin*. *Texts* i. 34, "without saying anything to anybody."

[2] Time of illness seems to be overlooked here. *Cf*. above, pp. 308, 318.

Invited means: invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.[1]

With a meal means: that to which he is invited with a meal.

If a monk be there means: he is able to enter having asked (for permission).

If a monk be not there means: he is unable to enter having asked (for permission).

Before the meal means: invited to it, he is one who has not eaten it.

After the meal means: invited to it, even (as much as) becomes eaten with a blade of grass.[2]

A family means: there are four (kinds of) families: a noble family, a brahmin family, a merchant family, a low-caste family.[3]

Should call on families means: there is an offence of wrong-doing for entering the precincts of the house of another. If he makes the first foot cross the threshold,[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot cross, there is an offence of expiation.[5]

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

Time of giving robes means: the last month of the rainy season when the kaṭhina cloth is not (formally) made, the five months when the kaṭhina cloth is (formally) made.[6]

Time of making robes means: when the robes are being made. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is invited when he is invited (and), except at the right time, calls on families before the meal or after the meal, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is invited . . . If he thinks that he is not invited when he is

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 51, 324, 333. The five are given at p. 330.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 328.

[3] *Cf. B.D.* i. 325.; *Vin.* iv. 80, 272.

[4] *ummāra.* At *Vin.* iv. 160 *indakhīla* is defined as the threshold (*ummāra*) of the sleeping-room.

[5] =*Vin.* iv. 160.

[6] *Cf.* above, p. 311; *Vin.* iv. 286.

invited . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is invited when he is not invited, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt [**100**] as to whether he is not invited, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not invited when he is not invited, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence, if at the right time, he enters having asked (for permission) if a monk be there; if he enters not having asked (for permission) if a monk be not there; if the way is through the house of another; if the way is through the precincts of a house; if he is going into a village[1]; if he is going to the nuns' quarters; if he is going to a sleeping-place of adherents of other sects[2]; if he is going on his way back[3]; if he is going to a house for food[4]; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.[5] || 3 || **6** ||

The Sixth

[1] *VA.* 857 says that if his dwelling-place is inside a village and he is going to it.

[2] *titthiyaseyyā.* *Comy.* does not explain.

[3] *paṭikkamanaṃ gacchati.*

[4] *bhattiyaghara.* *VA.* 857 says, "the house where he is invited or the house of the donors of ticket-food and so on."

[5] *Cf. Vin.* iv. 166.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLVII

. . . among the Sakyans in Kapilavatthu at the Banyan monastery. Now at that time Mahānāma the Sakyan[1] had abundant medicine. Then Mahānāma the Sakyan approached the lord, and having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Mahānāma the Sakyan spoke thus to the lord:

" I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for four months."

" Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for four months."

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

" I allow you, monks, to accept[2] an invitation (to accept) a requisite for four months." || 1 ||

Then monks asked Mahānāma the Sakyan for a little medicine, (although) Mahānāma the Sakyan had abundant medicine as before.[3] A second time did Mahānāma the Sakyan approach the lord . . . spoke thus to the lord:

" I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for an additional four months."

" Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for an additional four months."

---

[1] Mahānāma Sakka, a cousin of Gotama, and belonging to a Sakyan family of Kapilavatthu. He had not entered the Order, or he would have been called Sakyaputtiya, lit. son of the Sakyan(s), a distinction which should therefore be preserved in translations. Referred to at *A*. i. 26 as an *upāsaka*, chief of those who give choice things. *Cf*. *AA*. i. 393.

[2] *sādituṃ*, to consent to, to permit.

[3] *tath' eva*.

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, to accept a renewed invitation."[1] || 2 ||

Then monks asked Mahānāma the Sakyan for just[2] a little medicine, (although) Mahānāma the Sakyan had abundant medicine as before. A third time [**101**] did Mahānāma the Sakyan approach the lord . . . spoke thus to the lord:

"I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for life."[3]

"Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for life."

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, to accept a permanent invitation."[4] || 3 ||

Now at that time the group of six monks had become improperly dressed, improperly clothed, not decently attired.[5] Mahānāma the Sakyan became a speaker[6]:

"Why are you, honoured sirs, improperly dressed, improperly clothed, not decently attired? On going forth, should not one become properly dressed, properly clothed, decently attired?"

The group of six monks grumbled at Mahānāma the

---

[1] *punapavāraṇā*, or a further, additional offer or invitation. *Cf. AA.* i. 393, where, after a year, the teacher does not consent to Mahānāma's giving for any further period. [2] *yeva.*

[3] One of the boons conferred on Visākhā was that she might give medicines for the sick for life, *Vin.* i. 292 ff. [4] *niccapavāraṇā.*

[5] *dunnivatthā duppārutā anākappasampannā. Cf. Vin.* i. 44, where monks went for alms like this, and *Vin.* ii. 212, where they went to the refectory like this, and spread out their outer cloaks (*saṅghāṭi*). See *Vin. Texts* i. 152, iii. 285 for slightly different translations, and see above, p. 32, nn. 3, 4, on *nivattha* and *pāruta.* Rules for going properly clad and with decent deportment into houses for alms are given at *Vin.* ii. 213, 215, and Sekhiyas 31-55= *Vin.* iv. 191 ff. The word *ākappasampanna* occurs at *A.* iii. 78, "it is hard to find one gone forth when old who is *ākappa°*."

[6] *vattā hoti. Cf. vattar* at *A.* i. 32, v. 79; *D.* i. 139.

Sakyan. Then it occurred to the group of six monks: "Now, in what way could we bring shame[1] to Mahānāma the Sakyan?" Then it occurred to the group of six monks: "The Order is invited by Mahānāma the Sakyan (to accept) medicine. Come, your reverences, let us ask Mahānāma the Sakyan for ghee." Then the group of six monks approached Mahānāma the Sakyan, and having approached they spoke thus to Mahānāma the Sakyan:

"Sir, we want a *doṇa*[2] measure of ghee."

"Honoured sirs, wait this day (only)[3]; people are going to the cattle-pen to get ghee; you may fetch it in the morning."

A second time . . . A third time did the group of six monks speak thus: . . . ". . . in the morning."

"Do you, sir, not give what you invited (us to accept) because you do not desire to give what you invited (us to accept)?"

Then Mahānāma the Sakyan looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these revered sirs, being told: 'Wait this day (only), honoured sirs,' not wait?"

Monks heard Mahānāma the Sakyan as he . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks being told by Mahānāma the Sakyan, 'Wait this day (only), honoured sirs,' not wait?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, being told . . . did not wait?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, being told by Mahānāma the Sakyan . . . not wait? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When a monk is not ill, an invitation (to accept) a

[1] *maṅkuṃ kareyyāma*. *Cf.* above, p. 178.
[2] See *B.D.* i. 104, n. 2.
[3] *Cf. Vin.* iii. 220 f.=above, p. 64.

requisite[1] for four months may be accepted, [102] unless there be a renewed invitation, unless there be a permanent invitation. If one should accept for longer than that, there is an offence of expiation." || 4 || 1 ||

When a monk is not ill, an invitation (to accept) a requisite for four months may be accepted means: an invitation (to accept) a requisite may be accepted by one who is ill.[2]

And *a renewed invitation* may be accepted means: if he thinks, 'When I become ill, then I will ask.'

And *a permanent invitation* may be accepted means: if he thinks, 'When I become ill, then I will ask.'

If one should accept for longer than that means: there is an invitation limited to medicines, not limited to nights[3]; there is an invitation limited to nights, not limited to medicines; there is an invitation limited to medicines and limited to nights; there is an invitation neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights.

Limited to medicines means: if he says, "I invite (them to accept) just these medicines," medicines come to be taken up.

Limited to nights means: if he says, "I invite (them to accept) on just these nights," nights come to be taken up.

Limited to medicines and limited to nights means: if he says, "I invite (them to accept) just these medicines on just these nights," medicines come to be taken up and nights come to be taken up.

Neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights means:

---

[1] Or requisites.

[2] *VA.* 857 says, if at that time he is not ill, it (*i.e.*, the invitation) should not be rejected; if he becomes ill, he says, 'I will ask.'

[3] *bhesajjapariyantā na rattipariyantā.* *Cf.* above, p. 220, *āpattipariyantā na kulapariyantā.* *Cf.* also *Vin.* ii. 59, *āpattipariyantā ca rattipariyantā ca.* *Vin. Texts* ii. 416 translates for the latter, "the duration of the times," while *P.E.D.* gives "limitation of the probationary period." Here the limitation to nights (the Indian way of saying "days") seems to refer to the length of time or to particular nights for which the invitation would hold good.

there come to be medicines that are not taken up and there come to be nights that are not taken up.

In "limited to medicines," if, setting aside those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other medicines, there is an offence of expiation. In "limited to nights," if, setting aside those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other nights, there is an offence of expiation. In "limited to medicines and limited to nights," if setting aside those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept), if setting aside those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other medicines for other nights, there is an offence of expiation. In "neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights" there is no offence. || 1 ||

If he asks for medicine that is not to be used as medicine,[1] there is an offence of expiation. If he asks for one medicine that may be used as a different medicine,[2] there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is for longer than that when it is for longer than that (and) asks for medicine, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is for longer than that . . . If he thinks that it is not for longer than that when it is for longer than that . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is for longer than that when it is not for longer than that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not for longer than that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not for longer than that when it is not for longer than that, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he asks for those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept); if he asks for

---

[1] *VA.* 858 says that if he can keep himself going on mixed food, it is not called "used as medicine."

[2] *VA.* 858 says that if offered ghee he asks for oil, if offered an *āḷhaka* measure (he asks for) a *doṇa* measure.

those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept); if he asks, [**103**] explaining, 'Of those medicines which we were invited by you (to accept) we need this and that medicine'; if he asks, explaining, 'Those nights for which we were invited by you have passed and we need medicine'; if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if it is for the sake of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrongdoer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Seventh

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time King Pasenadi of Kosala came to march out against an army.[1] The group of six monks went to see the army fighting.[2] Then King Pasenadi of Kosala saw the group of six monks coming from afar; on seeing them, sending for them, he spoke thus:

"Why do you, honoured sirs, come here?"

"Sire, we want to see[3] your Majesty."

"What, honoured sirs, is the good of seeing me since it is the battle you delight in?[4] Should not the lord be seen?"

People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, come to see an army fighting? For us it is not profitable and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we come with the army for the sake of livelihood, on account of child and wife."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks go to see an army fighting?"

They told this matter to the lord. . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, went to see an army fighting?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, go to see an army fighting? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

---

[1] *senāya abbhuyyāto hoti*. *VA*. 858, *abbhuyyāto ti abhiuyyāto, parasenaṃ abhimukho gamissāmī ti nagarato niggato ti attho*, "the meaning is gone out from the town, thinking, 'I will go forth towards the opposing army.'" *Abbhuyyāta* occurs at *Vin*. i. 342; *M*. ii. 124.

[2] *uyyutta*, striving.

[3] *daṭṭhukāma*. *Cf*. *Sn*. 685.

[4] *yuddhâbhinandinā*. *Cf*. *Vin*. i. 73.

Whatever monk should go to see an army fighting, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** || [**104**]

Now at that time the uncle of a certain monk became ill in the army. He sent a messenger to that monk, saying: "I am indeed ill in the army, let the revered sir come. I want the revered sir to come."

Then it occurred to that monk: "A rule of training laid down by the lord says: 'There should be no going to see the army fighting,' but my uncle is ill in the army. What line of conduct should be followed by me?" He told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to go to an army when there is sufficient reason for it.[1] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should go to see an army fighting, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation." || **2** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Army fighting means: having gone out from the village, it comes to be camped or marched forth.[2] *Army* means elephants, horses, chariots, infantry.[3] An elephant (has) twelve men,[4] a horse (has) three men,[5] a chariot (has) four men,[6] the infantry (has) four men, hands on arrows.[7]

---

[1] *tathārūpapaccayā*. *Cf.* below, p. 399. [2] *payātā*.

[3] *Cf. Jā.* iv. 494. These four divisions of an army are fairly frequently alluded to in the Jātakas; see Index, under "Army," to Cambridge translation.

[4] *VA.* 838, four are mounted, two look after each foot.

[5] *VA.* 858, one is mounted, two look after the feet.

[6] *VA.* 858, one is the charioteer, one the warrior, two look after the linch-pins.

[7] *sarahatthā*, meaning presumably that each unit of infantry consists of archers.

If he *goes to see*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of expiation. If, having dismissed from sight,[1] he sees again, there is an offence of expiation.

Unless there is sufficient reason for it means: setting aside a sufficient reason for it. || 1 ||

If he thinks that there is fighting when there is fighting, (and) goes to see, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether there is fighting . . . If he thinks that there is not fighting when there is fighting . . . offence of expiation. If he goes to see one or other,[2] there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there is fighting when there is not fighting,[3] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether there is not fighting, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there is not fighting when there is not fighting, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, standing in the monastery, he sees; if it comes to a place where a monk is resting or to a place where he is sitting down or to a place where he is lying down[4]; if he, going along the opposite road, sees it; if there is a sufficient reason for it; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Eighth [**105**]

[1] *dassanūpacāraṃ vijahitvā*. *Cf.* above, p. 352. *VA*. 858 says, "if at a distance or down in a hollow he does not see, thinking, 'Standing here, it is impossible to see,' going to another place, there is a pācittiya in every act of seeing."

[2] *ekamekaṃ*. *VA*. 858, one or another of the four divisions of the army, elephants and so on.

[3] *VA*. 858 says that one man mounted on an elephant and a man at one foot of an elephant means "not fighting"; also a king going to a pleasaunce or to a river is "not fighting."

[4] *Cf.* above, pp. 158, 290.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) XLIX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having gone to the army as there was business, stayed with the army more than three nights. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, stay with the army? For us it is not profitable and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we stop[1] with the army for the sake of livelihood, on account of child and wife."

Monks heard these people . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks stay with the army for more than three nights?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, stayed with the army for more than three nights?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, stay with the army for more than three nights? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If there is for a monk some reason for going to an army, that monk may stay with the army for two nights, three nights. Should he stay longer than that, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

If there is for a monk some reason for going to an army means: if there is a reason, if there is business.

---

[1] *paṭivasāma*, balancing the monks' staying in the army; also against "come," *āgacchāma* of previous Pāc., and which balances the monks' going to see the army.

That monk may stay with the army for two nights, three nights means: he may stay two (or) three nights.

Should he stay longer than that means: if he stays with the army until sunset on the fourth day, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than three nights, (and) stays with the army, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than three nights . . . If he thinks that it is less when it is more than three nights . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than three nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than three nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than three nights, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he stays for two (or) three nights; if he stays for less than two (or) three nights; if having stayed for two nights, having departed on the third night before dawn, he stays again[1]; if he stays (because he is) ill; if he stays because there is something to be done for one who is ill [**106**] or if the army becomes invested by the opposing army[2]; if he comes to be taken possession of by something[3]; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Ninth

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 197.

[2] *senā vā paṭisenāya ruddhā hoti. VA.* 859 says, "inasmuch as its approach (or road, *sañcāra*) is cut off, so it becomes invested." *Cf. nagaraṃ rundhati* at *Jā.* i. 409; iii. 159; iv. 230.

[3] If he is invested by an enemy or by a chief, *VA.* 859.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) L

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, staying with the army for two (or) three nights, went to a sham-fight and to the troops in array and to the massing of the army and to see a review.[1] Then a certain monk of the group of six, having gone to a sham-fight, became pierced by an arrow. People made fun of that monk, saying:

" Honoured sir, we hope it was a good battle. How many targets were obtained by you ?"[2]

That monk, being made fun of by these people, became ashamed. People . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, come to see a sham-fight ? For us it is not profitable, and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we come to a sham-fight for the sake of livelihood, on account of child and wife."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can this group of six monks go to see a sham-fight ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, went to see a sham-fight ?"

" It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

---

[1] *uyyodhika balagga senābyūha anīkadassana.* All occur at *D.* i. 6; the first at *A.* v. 47. *VA.* 859 expl. the second term as " they know which is chief for strength," and also says (=*DA.* 85), it is the place for counting the strength (or forces)—*i.e.*, roll-calls as at *Dial.* i. 9. As to *vyūha*, *Jā.* ii. 406 mentions three types: *paduma-* (lotus), *cakka-* (wheel), *sakaṭa-* (waggon).

[2] *kati te lakkhāni laddhāni.* " Target " is *lakkha*, which also means a mark, or a high numeral, *cf.* lak (also spelt lac, lack, in modern times always implying rupees).

"How can you, foolish men, go to see a sham-fight? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If a monk, staying with the army for two nights, three nights, should go to a sham-fight or to the troops in array or to the massing of the army or to see a review, then is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

If a monk, staying with the army for two nights, three nights means: staying for two (or) three nights.

Sham-fight means: where a conflict[1] is seen.

Troops in array means: so many elephants, so many horses, so many chariots, so many infantry.

Massing of the army means: let elephants be on this side, let horses be on this side, let chariots be on this side, let foot-soldiers[2] be on this side.

A review means: a review of elephants, a review of horses, [**107**] a review of chariots, a review of infantry. The least elephant review (has) three elephants, the least horse review (has) three horses, the least chariot review (has) three chariots, the least infantry review (has) four men as infantry, hands on arrows.

If he goes to see, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of expiation. If, having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of expiation. If he goes to see one or other, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[3] || 1 ||

There is no offence if, standing in the monastery, he sees; if a conflict is seen, having come to a place where a monk is resting or to a place where he is sitting down or to a place where he is lying down; if he, going along

[1] *sampahāra*. [2] *pattikā* here.
[3] *Cf.* above, p. 376.

the opposite road, sees (it); if, going as there is something to be done, he sees (it); if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 || **2** ||

The Tenth

This is its key:

Cakes, talking, three on Upananda, and also (the
family who) supported (him),
Mahānāma, Pasenadi, the army, pierced, these ten.

The Fifth Division: that on the Naked Ascetic

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LI

. . . touring for alms in the Cetiya country,[1] set out for Bhaddavatikā.[2] Cowherds, goatherds, yeomen farmers, travellers saw the lord coming from afar, and seeing him they spoke thus to the lord: " Do not, lord, let the lord go to Ambatittha[3]; lord, in Ambatittha a serpent[4] lives in a matted-haired ascetic's hermitage; he has psychic potency, he is a terribly venomous snake; do not let him hurt the lord."[5] When they had spoken thus, the lord became silent. And a second time . . . And a third time cowherds, goatherds, yeomen farmers, travellers spoke thus to the lord:

" Do not, lord, let the lord go to Ambatittha; . . . do not let him hurt the lord." And a third time the lord became silent. Then the lord, touring for alms, in the course of time arrived at Bhaddavatikā. The lord stayed there at Bhaddavatikā. [**108**] Then the venerable Sāgata[6] approached the hermitage of the matted-hair ascetic of Ambatittha, and having approached, having entered the fire-room,[7] having made ready the grass mat,[8] he sat down cross-legged, the

---

[1] *Cetiyesu.* *D.P.P.N.* i. 911 says that " the people of Ceti seem to have had two distinct settlements," and thinks that the one referred to here is probably the later colony, lying to the east of the earliet one.

[2] A market-town near Kosambī. *D.P.P.N.* ii. 351.

[3] A village.

[4] *nāga.*

[5] For this passage *cf. Vin.* i. 24 f. and *Jā.* i. 360. The Surāpāna-jātaka is founded on this story.

[6] No verses in *Thag.* are ascribed to him. But at *A.* i. 25 he is called chief of those good at the heat-condition. See *AA.* i. 324 ff. At *Vin.* i. 179 he is called the lord's attendant at that time, and performed some feats of psychic potency.

[7] *Cf. M.* i. 501. *Agyāgāra* called at *Fur. Dial.* i. 353 " fire-hut," at *G.S.* v. 162 (=*A.* v. 234) " fire-house." *D.P.P.N* (art. " Ambatittha ") speaks of a " fire-place."

[8] *tiṇasanthāraka.*

back erect, having caused mindfulness to be present in front of him. Then that serpent, seeing that the venerable Sāgata had entered, bad at heart,[1] blew forth smoke. And the venerable Sāgata blew forth smoke. Then that serpent, not conquering anger, blazed up, and the venerable Sāgata, having attained to the condition of heat,[2] blazed up. Then the venerable Sāgata, having mastered by heat that serpent's heat, approached Bhaddavatikā. Then the lord, having stayed at Bhaddavatikā for as long as he found suitable, departed on an alms-tour to Kosambī. Lay-followers of Kosambī heard:

"They say that master Sāgata came into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha."

Then the lord, touring for alms, in the course of time arrived at Kosambī.

Then the lay-followers of Kosambī, having met the lord, approached the venerable Sāgata; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sāgata, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, the lay-followers of Kosambī spoke thus to the venerable Sāgata:

"Honoured sir, what is hard for the masters to obtain, and liked (by them)? What may we give?"

When they had spoken thus, the group of six monks spoke thus to the lay-followers of Kosambī:

"There is, your reverences, a spirituous liquor called white spirits[3]; it is hard for the monks to obtain, and liked (by them). Give that."

Then the lay-followers of Kosambī having given the

---

[1] *dummano*.

[2] *tejodhātu*; *cf*. *B.D*. i. 273, where Dabba attained this same condition.

[3] *kāpotikā nāma pasannā*. Called in the Surāpānajātaka, *Jā*. i. 360, *kāpotikā surā*, *pasannā kāpotikā* and *kāpotikā pasannā*, translated in Cambridge edn., vol. i., p. 207, as "white spirits, clear white spirit." *VA*. 859 says *kāpotikā* is a shining red colour like pigeons' feet; and *pasannā* is a synonym for *surāmaṇḍa*, the finest fermented liquor.

spirituous liquor, white spirits, in house after house, seeing that the venerable Sāgata had entered for alms-food, spoke thus to the venerable Sāgata:

"Honoured sir, let master Sāgata drink the spirituous liquor, white spirits; honoured sir, let master Sāgata drink the spirituous liquor, white spirits."

Then the venerable Sāgata, having drunk the spirituous liquor, white spirits, in house after house, as he was departing from the town fell down at the town-gate. Then the lord, departing from the town with a great company of monks, saw the venerable Sāgata fallen down at the town-gate; seeing him, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, take up Sāgata."

"Yes, lord," and these monks having answered the lord, having led the venerable Sāgata to the monastery, made him lie down with his head towards the lord. Then the venerable Sāgata, having turned round, went to sleep[1] with his feet towards the lord. Then the lord addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, formerly was not Sāgata respectful, deferential towards the tathāgata?" [**109**]

"Yes, lord."

"But monks, is Sāgata respectful, deferential towards the tathāgata now?"

"No, lord."

"Monks, did not Sāgata come into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha?"

"Yes, lord."

"But, monks, is Sāgata able to come into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha now?"

"No, lord."

"But, monks, could he become unconscious, having drunk that which may be drunk?"

"No, lord."

"Monks, it is not fitting for Sāgata, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can

[1] *seyyaṃ kappesi*, or "lay down in a sleeping-place."

Sāgata drink strong drink?[1] It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In drinking fermented liquor[2] and spirits[3] there is an offence of expiation." || 1 ||

Fermented liquor means: if it is fermented liquor from flour, fermented liquor from cakes, fermented liquor from cooked rice, if it is worked-up yeast,[4] if it is mixed with ingredients.[5]

Spirits means: if it is an extract from flowers,[6] an extract from fruits, an extract from honey,[7] an extract from sugar,[8] if it is mixed with ingredients.[9]

Should drink means: if he drinks even (as much as) with a blade of grass, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is strong drink when it is strong drink, (and) drinks it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is strong drink . . . If he thinks that it is not strong drink when it is strong drink, (and) drinks it, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is strong drink when it is not strong

[1] *majja*. At *Vin*. i. 205 *majja* was allowed to be put into oil in cases of illness. The six monks put in too much and became drunk. They were to be dealt with according to the rule (*i.e.*, this Pāc.). And the amount of *majja* allowed for the oil was such that neither its colour, smell nor taste was perceptible. At *D*. iii. 62, 63 it is said that *majja* should not be drunk—one of the five *sīlas*. *Cf*. also *Sn*. 398-400.

[2] *surā*.

[3] *meraya*. At the Council of Vesālī, *Vin*. ii. 294, it was affirmed that it was not allowable to drink *jalogi*, unfermented toddy; to do so would be to infringe the "surāmerayapāne pācittiya" (*Vin*. ii. 307). *M*. i. 238 states that the *acelaka*, naked ascetic, leaders do not drink *surā* or *meraya*.

[4] *kiṇṇapakkhitta*.

[5] *sambhārasaṃyuttā*. At *DA*. 944, *VvA*. 73, *KhA*. 26, *VbhA*. 381 these are given as the fivefold *surā*.

[6] *pupphâsava*. Referred to at *Jā*. iv. 117 as a *meraya*.

[7] *madhvâsava*. *P.E.D.* says, "wine from the flower of Bassia latifolia."

[8] *guḷâsava*.

[9] =*DA*. 944=*VvA*. 73=*KhA*. 26. At *VbhA*. 381 these are called five *āsavā* or extracts.

drink, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not strong drink, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not strong drink when it is not strong drink, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he drinks that which is not strong drink though it comes to be the colour of strong drink, the smell of strong drink, the taste of strong drink; if it is in a concoction of broth, in a concoction of meat, in a concoction of oil, in molasses and emblic myrobalam[1]; if he drinks a distilled liquor[2] that is not strong drink; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The First

[1] *āmalaka*, Phyllanthus emblica (*P.E.D.*). One of the fruits allowed as medicine, *Vin.* i. 201. Mentioned again as a medicine at *Vin.* i. 278.

[2] *ariṭṭha*, "a kind of liquor" (*C.P.D.*).

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made one of the group of seventeen monks laugh by tickling him with the fingers. This monk, faint and unable to get his breath, died.[1] Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks [110] make a monk laugh by tickling him with the fingers?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks . . . with the fingers?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men . . . with the fingers? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In tickling with the fingers there is an offence of expiation." ‖ **1** ‖

Tickling with the fingers means: if one who is ordained desiring to make laugh one who is ordained, rubs[2] the

---

[1] =*Vin.* iii. 84 (*B.D.* i. 146 f.). Though occurring in the Defeat Section, this offence is there said to be one not involving defeat; but as is sometimes the case, it is not said what kind of offence it is. This suggests that *Vin.* iii. 84 was formulated earlier than Pāc. LII. See *B.D.* i, Intr. xxxvi, for suggestion why the offence of causing death by this treatment is not a pārājika; also for some translations of *aṅgulipatodaka*. *So-sor-thar-pa*, 63, trans. S. C. Vidyabhusana, 1915, p. 30, gives, "pokes a person with the finger"; *Le Prātimokṣa-sūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, trans. Huber, *J. As.*, Nov.-Dec., 1913, p. 58, Pāc. 63 "chatouille quelqu'un avec le doigt." Bu., *VA.* 860, defines as *aṅgulīhi upakacchâdighaṭṭanaṃ vuccati*, "It is called striking (or touching, *ghaṭṭana*) the arm-pits (loins, legs, *upakacchā*), and so on, with the fingers."

[2] *āmasati*, see *B.D.* i. 203, n. 6.

body with the body, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) makes him laugh by tickling with the fingers, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained . . . If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained . . . an offence of expiation. If he rubs something attached to the body[1] with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs the body with something attached to the body . . . wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with something attached to the body . . . wrong-doing. If he rubs the body with something that may be cast,[2] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with something that may be cast . . . wrong-doing. If he rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs the body of one who is not ordained[3] with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with the body . . . the body with something attached to the body . . . something attached to the body with something attached to the body . . . the body with something that may be cast . . . something attached to the body with something that may be cast . . . something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[4] || 2 ||

---

[1] *kāyapaṭibaddha*. *Cf. B.D.* i. 204 ff.=*Vin.* iii. 120 ff.
[2] *nissaggiya*. *Cf. B.D.* i. 204 ff.=*Vin.* iii. 120 ff.
[3] *anupassampannaṃ kāyena kāyaṃ āmasati*. *VA.* 860 says that he may touch a nun for amusement, instead of one not ordained.
[4] This surely is an error for *anāpatti*, no offence.

There is no offence if, not desiring laughter, he rubs (him) if there is something to be done[1]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Second

---

[1] *sati karaṇīye*=above, p. 381. *Cf. sati paccaye* at *Vin.* iv. 83, 85 ff.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks were sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī. [111] Now at that time King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, came to be on the upper storey of the palace[1] together with Queen Mallikā. King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, saw the group of seventeen monks sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī; seeing them he spoke thus to Queen Mallikā:

"Mallikā, these who are sporting in the water are men perfected."[2]

"Undoubtedly, sire, a rule of training has not been laid down by the lord, or these monks are not conversant[3] (with it)."

Then it occurred to King Pasenadi, the Kosalan:

"Is there not some device by which I would not speak to the lord but (yet) the lord would know that these monks sported in the water?"

Then King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, having had the group of seventeen monks summoned, gave them a large sugar-ball,[4] saying:

"Honoured sirs, give this sugar-ball to the lord."

The group of seventeen monks, taking that sugar-ball, approached the lord, and having approached they spoke thus to the lord:

"Lord, King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, gives this sugar-ball to the lord."

"But, monks, where did the King see you?"

---

1 *uparipāsādavaragato hoti*; *cf. Vin.* iv. 158, and on *pāsāda*, *cf.* above, p. 16, n. 5.

2 *arahanto.*

3 *a-ppakata-ññū.* *C.P.D.* gives, "not knowing what is appointed . . . ignorant of the main point." *Cf. Vin.* iv. 143.

4 *guḷapiṇḍa.*

"Sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, sport in the water? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In playing[1] in the water, there is an offence of expiation." ‖ 1 ‖

Playing in the water means: if desiring laughter he immerses (the part) above the ankle in the water, or draws it out or swims,[2] there is an offence of expiation. ‖ 1 ‖

If he thinks that it is playing when it is playing in the water, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is playing in the water . . . If he thinks that it is not playing when it is playing in the water, there is an offence of expiation. If he sports in the water with (the part) below the ankle, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sports with a boat,[3] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he strikes the water with the hand or with the foot or with a stick[4] or with a sherd,[4] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sports with water in a bowl,[5] or with sour rice-gruel or with milk or with butter-milk or with dye-stuff or with urine or with mud, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is playing when it is not playing in the water, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not playing in the water, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not playing when it is not playing in the water, there is no offence. ‖ 2 ‖

---

[1] *hāsadhamma*, or, a thing of laughter. *VA.* 861 *udakakīḷikā vuccati.*

[2] *palavati*, *VA.* 861 *tarati*, crosses, using either his hands or feet. See *Dhp.* 334, *Thag.* 399.

[3] *nāvāya*; hauling it up on a bank or propelling it with rudder and oars, *VA.* 861.

[4] *Cf. A.* i. 124=*Pug.* 30, 36.

[5] *bhājanagata*, *cf. B.D.* i. 77, 85, and notes.

There is no offence if, not desiring laughter, plunging into the water if there is something to be done, [**112**] he immerses or draws out or swims; if, going to the other side,[1] he immerses or draws out or swims; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Third

[1] *pāraṃ.*

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LIV

. . . at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa indulged in bad habits.[1] The monks said:

" Reverend Channa, do not do that, it is not allowable." He did the same (things) out of disrespect.[2] Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

" How can the venerable Channa do a disrespectful thing ?" . . .

" Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, did a disrespectful thing ?"

" It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

" How can you, foolish man, do a disrespectful thing ? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In disrespect there is an offence of expiation."[3] || **1** ||

Disrespect means: there are two (kinds of) disrespect: disrespect for a man and disrespect for dhamma. *Disrespect for a man* means: if being spoken to by one

---

[1] *Cf. B.D.* i. 309; *Vin.* iv. 35, 141.

[2] *anādariyaṃ paṭicca karoti yeva. Cf. Vin.* iv. 185, 349. At *Vin.* ii. 220 the group of six monks behaved disrespectfully (*anādariyaṃ paṭicca*) to the theras. At *Pug.* 20=*Dhs.* 1325=*Vbh.* 359 *anādariyaṃ* is one of the terms used to define *dovacassatā*, contumacy. *Cf. A.* v. 146, where the word occurs with *dovacassatā* and *pāpamittatā*.

[3] At *Vin.* i. 176 there are three cases of *anādariye pācittiyaṃ* connected with ill monks and the Pavāraṇā ceremony.

who is ordained concerning what is laid down, thinking, 'This one is suspended[1] or disparaged[2] or blameworthy,[3] his bidding will not come to be done,' he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of expiation. *Disrespect for dhamma* means: if being spoken to by one who is ordained concerning what is laid down, (saying), 'How may this be lost or destroyed or disappear? or, he does not wish to learn this,'[4] he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained . . . If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained . . . offence of expiation. If being spoken to by one who is ordained concerning what is not laid down,[5] thinking, 'This does not conduce to expunging (evil)[6] nor to punctiliousness nor to graciousness nor to decreasing (the obstructions) nor to putting forth energy,'[7] he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If being spoken to by one who is not ordained concerning what is laid down or concerning what is not laid down, thinking, 'This does not conduce to expunging (evil) . . . nor to putting forth energy,' he does a disrespectful thing, **[113]** there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[8] || 2 ||

---

[1] *ukkhittaka*. *Cf. Vin.* i. 97, 121; ii. 61, 173, 213; iv. 137.
[2] *vambhita*.
[3] *garahita*. *Cf. Dhp.* 30, *Sn.* 313.
[4] *I.e.*, according to *VA.* 861, "what is laid down."
[5] *VA.* 861, what has not been handed down in the Suttas or Abhidhamma.
[6] *sallekhā*.
[7] See *B.D.* i. 37 (and notes), 296.
[8] Doubtless should read *anāpatti*, no offence.

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: 'Thus the version[1] of our teachers is an interrogation '[2]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 2 ||

The Fourth

---

[1] *uggaha.* See *Vism.* 96, 99, translated, *P.T.S.* edn., 'version' and 'text.' *VA.* 861 says, 'in this matter the version of the teacher as to respect should not be adopted, but the version of the teacher that has come down as custom should be adopted.'

[2] *paripucchā.* Perhaps 'questionable.' *Cf.* above, pp. 271, 275, 278.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LV

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks frightened[1] the group of seventeen monks. These, being frightened, cried out. Monks spoke thus:

"Why do you, your reverences, cry out?"

"Your reverences, this group of six monks frightened us."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks frighten a monk?" . . . (see Pāc. LII. 1) . . . ". . . should be set forth: Whatever monk should frighten a monk, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Should frighten means: if one who is ordained, desirous of frightening one who is ordained, arranges a form or a sound or a smell or a taste or a touch,[2] whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of expiation. If he points out the wilds of thieves, or the wilds of beasts of prey, or the wilds of goblins,[3] whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) frightens (him), there is an offence of expiation.

---

[1] *bhiṃsāpenti.*

[2] *Cf. B.D.* i. 133 f. (=*Vin.* iii. 77 f.). *VA.* 862 says, "offering a form and so on is to be explained according to the meaning in *manussaviggaha*," human form—*i.e.*, in *Comy.* on Defeat III.

[3] *pisācakantāra.* At *Jā.* i. 99 five kinds of *kantāra* are given, the first two as above and three others; each is defined. Four kinds at *Nd.* ii. 630.

If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained . . . If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained (and) frightens (him), there is an offence of expiation. If he is desirous of frightening one who is not ordained (and) arranges a form . . . a touch, whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he points out the wilds of thieves . . . or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. [**114**] If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1] || 2 ||

There is no offence if, not desirous of frightening, he arranges a form or a sound or a smell or a taste or a touch, or points out the wilds of thieves or the wilds of beasts of prey or the wilds of goblins; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Fifth

[1] Doubtless should read, as in Pāc. LIV, *anāpatti*, no offence.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LVI

. . . was staying in the Bhagga country at Crocodile Hill[1] in Bhesakaḷā grove[2] in the deer-park. Now at that time monks, kindling in the winter time a fire of large hollow logs, warmed themselves.[3] And in that hollow a dark poisonous snake[4] was scorched by the fire; issuing forth, he pursued the monks. The monks ran about here and there.[5] Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, kindling a fire, warm themselves?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, kindling a fire, warmed yourselves?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, kindling a fire, warm themselves? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, desirous of warming himself, should kindle or should cause a fire to be kindled, there is an offence of expiation."

---

[1] Suṃsumāragiri. *VA.* 862 says it is the name of a town. It was probably the capital. Here were formulated two other Vinaya rules: *Vin.* ii. 127, iv. 198; *cf. Vin.* v. 145. Anumāna Sutta, *M.* i. 95, Māratajjaniya Sutta, *M.* i. 332, Bodhirājakumāra Sutta, *M.* ii. 91, uttered here.

[2] Called after the yakkhinī who presided there, *SA.* ii. 249.

[3] *visibbesuṃ*, from *visibbeti=visīveti*, to thaw, to warm oneself; another *visibbeti* means to sew. *Cf. visibbesuṃ* at *Vin.* i. 31-32, where the Jaṭilas "warmed themselves" at vessels of burning fire after emerging from the cold river. *Cf. visīvetvā* at *Miln.* 47; and *visīvetuṃ* twice, at *Jā.* ii. 68 with *v.ll.*, one being *visibbituṃ*.

[4] *kaṇhasappa. Cf. Vin.* iii. 20.

[5] *tahaṃ tahaṃ. Cf. Jā.* i. 384.

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, inquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks: "We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going."

"Formerly, your reverences, we, kindling a fire, used to warm ourselves; thus there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, (and) being scrupulous, we do not warm ourselves; thus there comes to be no comfort for us."[1]

They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, kindling or causing a fire to be kindled, to warm yourselves. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, not being ill, desirous of warming himself, should kindle [**115**] or should cause a fire to be kindled, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 || **1** ||

Now at that time monks, being scrupulous, did not light a lamp in the fire-room[2] or in the bath-room.[3] They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, to kindle or to cause a fire to be kindled when there is a sufficient reason for it.[4] And thus . . . should be set forth:

Whatever monk, not being ill, desirous of warming himself, should kindle or should cause a fire to be kindled, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation." || **2** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 277, 342, below, p. 402.

[2] *jotika*, according to *VA*. 862, a fire for the purpose of sweating: *pattapacanasedakammâdīsu jotikaraṇe*.

[3] See *Vin. Texts* i. 157, n. 2; iii. 103.

[4] *Cf.* above, p. 375.

Not being ill means: he for whom there comes to be comfort without a fire.

Ill means: he for whom there does not come to be comfort without a fire.

Desirous of warming himself means: wishing to heat himself.[1]

A fire[2] means: what is called a fire.[3]

Should kindle means: if he himself kindles, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause to be kindled means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he kindles much, there is an offence of expiation.

Unless there is a sufficient reason for it means: setting aside a sufficient reason for it.[4] || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) desirous of warming himself, kindles or causes a fire to be kindled, unless there is a sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ill . . . If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill . . . offence of expiation. If he picks up a fallen fire-brand,[5] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if he is ill; if he warms himself at one made by another; if he warms himself over raked-out embers[6]; if at a lamp, in a fire-room, in a bath-room; if there is a sufficient reason for it; if there are dangers[7]; if he is mad; if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **3** ||

The Sixth

[1] *tappitukāma*. [2] *joti*. [3] *aggi*.

[4] *VA*. 862 says, " setting aside lamps and so on, there is no offence in kindling (a fire) when there is another suitable reason for it."

[5] *patilātaṃ ukkhipati*. *VA*. 862 says *ḍayhamānaṃ alātaṃ patitaṃ* (*v.l. patati taṃ*) *ukkhipati*, if he picks up a glowing fire-brand that has fallen.

[6] *vitacchitaṅgāra*.

[7] *VA*. 862—*i.e.*, from nasty beasts of prey and beings other than human.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LVII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time monks used to bathe in the Tapodā.[1] Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, thinking: "I will bathe (my) head," [116] having gone to the Tapodā, waited for (them) at a respectful distance, thinking: "(I will wait) as long as the masters bathe." The monks bathed until the dark of the night. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, bathing (his) head at the wrong time, staying outside the town because the town gate was closed, when it was early morning[2] approached the lord, anointed,[3] perfumed[4]; having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

"Why do you, sire, come in the early morning, anointed, perfumed?"

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha told this matter to the lord. Then the lord roused . . . delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with dhamma-talk. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having been roused . . . delighted by the lord with dhamma-talk, rising from his seat, greeting the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, though having seen the king, not knowing moderation, bathed?"

---

[1] A lake, and also a river; lit. the hot waters. The lake was cool, but the river flowing from it was hot; see *Vin.* iii. 108 (*B.D.* i. 188), quoted at *DA.* i. 35, *UdA.* 110.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 274.

[3] *asambhinnena.* *P.E.D.* says that this at the above passage is the "name of a kind of ointment."

[4] *vilepanena.*

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these foolish men, though having seen the king, not knowing moderation, bathe? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **1** ||

Now at that time monks, being scrupulous, did not bathe in the hot weather, in the fever weather; they lay down[1] with limbs covered with sweat; robes and lodgings got soiled. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, in the hot weather, in the fever weather, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: thinking, 'a month and a half of the summer remains,' (and) 'the first month of the rains'—these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather. In this case this is a right time." [**117**]

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **2** ||

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, inquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks: "We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going."

"Formerly, your reverences, we used to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month; thus there came

---

[1] *sayanti*, or, went to sleep.

to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, (and) being scrupulous, we do not bathe; thus there comes to be no comfort for us."[1]

They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case . . . when there is fever weather, at a time of illness. In this case this is a right time."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **3** ||

Now at that time monks making repairs, being scrupulous, did not bathe; they lay down with limbs covered with sweat; robes and lodgings got soiled. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at a time of work,[2] to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. . . ."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **4** ||

Now at that time monks, having gone on a journey, being scrupulous, did not bathe; they lay down with limbs covered with sweat. . . . They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, at a time of going on a journey, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an

[1] *Cf.* above, pp. 277, 342, 399.

[2] Or, of building, *kammasamaya*; see *Old Comy.'s* definition below.

offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: . . ."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || **5** ||

Now at that time several monks, making robes in the open air, became assailed[1] by a dusty wind, and the god was raining little by little.[2] The monks, being scrupulous, did not bathe; they lay down with damp limbs; robes and lodgings [118] got soiled. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

" I allow you, monks, at a time of wind and rain,[3] to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is a right time: thinking, ' a month and a half of the summer remains,' (and) ' the first month of the rains '—these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather; at a time of illness, at a time of work, at a time of going on a journey, at a time of wind and rain. This is a right time in this case." || **6** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Less than half a month[4] means: less than half a month.[5]

Should bathe means: if he bathes with chunam or with clay,[6] in each action there is an offence of wrong-doing; when the bathing is completed there is an offence of expiation.

Except at a right time means: setting a right time to one side.

---

[1] *okiṇṇā.*

[2] *devo ca thokaṃ thokaṃ phusāyati. Cf. S.* i. 184, *Ud.* 5, *devo ekaṃ ekaṃ phusāyati.*

[3] *vātavuṭṭhi. Cf. A.* iii. 378; *SnA.* 34.

[4] *oren' addhamāsaṃ.*

[5] *ūnakaddhamāsaṃ.*

[6] *Cf. Vin.* i. 202, where monks with affections of the skin are allowed to use *cuṇṇa,* chunam, while those who are in health are permitted *mattikā,* clay. *Cf.* also *Vin.* i. 47=52, and see notes at *Vin. Texts* i. 157; *Vin.* ii. 120, 220, 224.

Hot weather means: a month and a half of the summer remains. *Fever weather* means: the first month of the rains. Thinking, 'these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather,' there may be bathing.

Time of illness means: if there comes to be no comfort for one without bathing; thinking, 'it is a time of illness,' there may be bathing.

Time of work means: even a cell comes to be cleaned; thinking, 'it is a time of work,' there may be bathing.

Time of going on a journey means: saying, 'we will go half a yojana,' there may be bathing; there may be bathing when going, there may be bathing when gone.[1]

Time of wind and rain means: if monks become assailed by a dusty wind, if two or three drops of rain come to be fallen on the body, thinking, 'it is a time of wind and rain,' there may be bathing. || 1 ||

If he thinks that it is less when it is less than half a month, (and) bathes, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than half a month . . . If he thinks that it is more when it is less than half a month . . . offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than half a month, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than half a month, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is more when it is more than half a month, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if it is at a right time; if he bathes at (intervals of) the half-month; if he bathes (at intervals of) more than half a month; if he bathes going to the further bank[2]; if he is in nothing but bordering districts[3]; if there are accidents[4]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 7 ||

The Seventh [**119**]

---

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 312.
[2] *pāraṃ gacchanto nhāyati.* *Cf.* above, p. 392.
[3] *sabbapaccantimesu janapadesu.* Bu. gives no explanation.
[4] Such as being pursued by bees, *VA.* 863.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LVIII

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time many monks and wanderers were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvatthī. On the way, thieves, having issued forth, robbed them. At Sāvatthī hirelings of the king,[1] having issued forth, having seized these thieves with the goods, sent a messenger to the monks, saying:

"Let the revered sirs come; let each, recognising his own robe, take it."[2]

The monks did not recognise them. They[3] looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered sirs not recognise their own robes?"[4]

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, having given reasoned talk on what is befitting, on what is suitable, addressed the monks, saying:

"On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks based on ten grounds: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order . . . for establishing what is verily dhamma, for following discipline.[5] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When a monk obtains a new robe, any one mode of

---

[1] *rājabhaṭa*, persons in royal service. At *Vin.* i. 74 it is a dukkaṭa to confer the pabbajā on these. *Cf.* *Vin.* i. 88.

[2] *sakaṃ sakaṃ cīvaraṃ saṃjānitvā gaṇhantu.*

[3] *I.e.*, the hirelings.

[4] *attano attano cīvaraṃ na saṃjānissanti.*

[5] =*Vin.* iii. 21 (*B.D.* i. 37 f.)=iii. 232 (above, p. 87)=*A.* i. 98, 100 (*G.S.* i. 84, 85)=*A.* v. 70 (*G.S.* v. 50).

disfigurement[1] of the three modes of disfigurement must be taken[2]: either dark green or mud(-colour) or black.[3] If a monk should make use of a new robe without taking[4] any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement, there is an offence of expiation.[5]" || 1 ||

New means: it is called so if not made allowable.[6]
Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes.[7]
Any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement must be taken means: even (as little as) with a blade of grass must be taken.
Dark green[8] means: there are two (kinds of) dark

---

[1] *dubbaṇṇakaraṇaṃ*. *VA.* 863 says *dubbaṇṇakaraṇaṃ ādātabban ti etaṃ kappabinduṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ*. *P.E.D.* calls *kappabindu* a "small black dot or smudge imprinted on a new robe to make it lawful" (*kappa*). Huber, *J. As.*, 1913, has (Pāc. 59): "si un bhikṣu reçoit un vetement neuf, il doit employer une des trois manières pour en détruire la belle couleur." At *Vin.* i. 255 the kaṭhina-cloth is called "made (*atthata*) if it is made allowable (*kappakata*)." *S.* v. 217, *dubbaṇṇakaraṇī jare*=*K.S.* v. 192, "age that makes the colour fade."

[2] *ādātabbaṃ*, from *ādiyati*, to take up, take to oneself. *Cf. VA.* 684, *ādātabbâ ti gahetabbā*. *Vin. Texts* i. 45, "he must choose." *Cf. Vin.* i. 50, *na ekacco pacchāsamaṇo ādātabbo*=*Vin. Texts* i. 163, "let him not take anyone else with him as his companion."

[3] *Vin. Texts* i. 45, "either (making part of it) dark blue, or (marking part of it with) mud, or (making part of it) black."

[4] *anādā*.

[5] The robe must be disfigured so as to be identifiable by the monk to whom it belongs. *Cf.* Nissag. XV, where portions of an old rug have to be added to a new rug "so as to disfigure it," although not for purposes of identification.

[6] *akatakappa*. The robe is made allowable by having a smudge made upon it, *VA.* 863. At *Vin.* i. 215 fruit that is *akatakappa* is allowed to be eaten, even when there is no one there to make it allowable (*kappiyakāraka*, *cf. Vin.* i. 211) for the monks by offering it to them. *Cf. akappakata* occurring below at 2, 3.

[7] *Cf.* above, pp. 40, 48. Here *VA.* 863 says, whatever he is able to put on, to dress in (using *nivāsetuṃ* and *pārupituṃ*, the verbs referring to the inner robe, and to the upper robe and outer cloak, *cf.* p. 32, nn. 2, 3); the "least robe fit for assignment" is not meant. *Cf.* above, p. 287.

[8] *nīla*, often translated as blue, dark blue. But *Old Comy.* lends support for green here. See Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Bud. Psy.*, 1924, 49, n.

green: the dark green of bronze,[1] the dark green of foliage.[2]

Mud(-colour)[3] means: it is called water.[4]

Black[5] means: anything that is of black.[6]

If a monk . . . without taking any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement means: [**120**] if a monk makes use of a new robe without having taken[7] any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement, even (as little as) with a blade of grass, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he makes use of it, thinking that he has not taken[8] when he has not taken, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he has not taken . . . If he makes use of it, thinking that he has taken when he has not taken, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he has not taken when he has taken, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he has taken, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he has taken when he has taken, there is no offence. || 2 ||

---

[1] *kaṃsanīla; kaṃsa* is bronze, or sometimes metal. *VA.* 863 explains by *cammakāranīla*, the *nīla* of a leather-worker, and says that according to Mahāpaccariya it is called *ayomala* (*v.l. ayomaya*) and *lohamala*, an iron- (or metal-) stain, a copper- (brass- or bronze-) stain.

[2] *palāsanīla*, explained at *VA.* 863. *yo koci nīlavaṇṇo paṇṇaraso*, whatever is a heap of leaves is *nīla* colour. At *VvA.* 197, *PvA.* 158, *harita*, usually translated as "green," is explained by *nīla*.

[3] *kaddama.*

[4] *odaka.* At *Vin.* ii. 262 monks and nuns sprinkled one another with *kaddamodaka*, muddy water (*kaddama-udaka*).

[5] *kāḷasāma.* Both *kāḷa* and *sāma* can mean black, dark. At *M.* i. 246 the words mean, according to *P.E.D.*, black, brown, respectively; so translated at *Fur. Dial.* i. 176. But *P.E.D.* also says (art. *kāḷa*) that "*kāḷa-sāma* at *Vin.* iv. 120 is to be taken as dark-grey," while under art. *sāma* it says, "*Vin.* iv. 120 (kāḷasāma dark blue [?])." Some words for colours may, in the Canon, have denoted more than one colour, or nothing very definite and fixed; or we may not yet know exactly to what colour some of the words for colours refer.

[6] *kāḷasāmaka*, or blackish, darkish.

[7] *anādiyitvā.*

[8] *anādinna*, presumably referring to a "disfigurement."

There is no offence if, having taken, he makes use of it; if what is allowable becomes destroyed[1]; if what made the appearance allowable becomes worn away[2]; if what was not made allowable[3] becomes sewn together[4] with what was made allowable[5]; if there is a patch[6]; if there is a braiding[7]; if there is a binding[8]; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Eighth

---

[1] *kappo naṭṭho hoti*, perhaps if the smudge (*bindu*) disappears in some way.

[2] *kappakatokāso jiṇṇo hoti.*

[3] *akappakataṃ.* Again *cf. VA.* 863 and above, p. 407.

[4] *saṃsibbitaṃ hoti. Cf. Vism.* 1, *Miln.* 102, 148.

[5] *kappakatena*, as *C.P.D.* says, by *kappabindu. Vin.* iv. 286, *samaṇacīvaraṃ nāma kappakataṃ vuccati*, a recluse's robe is called what is made allowable. At *Vin.* i. 254, 255, the expressions occur, *na akappakatena atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ ; kappakatena atthataṃ hoti kaṭhinaṃ*, translated at *Vin. Texts* ii. 155, 156, " when the ceremony has (has not) fallen through," p. 155, n. 2, saying, " akappakatenâ ti anādinna-kappa-bindhunā (B.), which we do not understand. Perhaps we should read bindunā." See *VA.* 1111 for this definition, and where reading is *bindunā.* The sense is that the kaṭhina-cloth is not properly made if it is not made allowable—*i.e.*, through not taking a disfiguring smudge by which the owner can identify it.

[6] *aggaḷa. VA.* 863, " putting these *aggaḷa*, and so on, on to a robe after it is made allowable is not a device for making it allowable (*kappakaraṇakicca*)." *Aggaḷa*, patch, strip of cloth, was used for strengthening robes. See *Vin.* i. 290, where a monk's inner robe was torn and he inserted a " strip of cloth " and was commended by the lord. Bu. says (see *VA.* 1128), *aggaḷam acchādeyyan* (text, *acchupeyyaṃ*) *ti chinnaṭṭhāne pilotika-khaṇḍaṃ laggāpeyyaṃ* (*v.l. ṭhapeyyaṃ*): " (what now) if I should stick bits of cloth (or rags) into the torn places ?" *VA.* 1129 gives, *suttalūkhaṃ kātun ti sutten' eva aggaḷaṃ kātun ti attho*, " to darn roughly with thread means to darn a patch with thread."

[7] *anuvāta. Vin. Texts* ii. 154, n. 1, *anuvāta-karaṇa-mattenâ ti piṭṭhi-anuvāta-āropana-mattena*, from which it appears that the *anuvāta* was put along the back of the robe. *Anuvāta* used in expl. of *kusi* at *Vin.* i. 287, see *Vin. Texts* ii. 208, n. 5. *VA.* 684 uses the word in explaining the rule for disfiguring a rug. *C.P.D.* calls *anuvāta* " prob. a collar or facing (on a monk's cowl)."

[8] *paribhaṇḍa. Vin. Texts* ii. 154, n. 2, *paribhaṇḍa-karaṇa-mattenâ ti kucchi-anuvāta-āropana-mattena*, put inside. Bu. on *Vin.* i. 297 again explains *anuvāta* and *paribhaṇḍa* " by the words

themselves," see *Vin. Texts* ii. 231, n. 2. The two words occur again at *Vin.* i. 254 as things to be used in making a kaṭhina-cloth robe, and at *Vin.* ii. 116 as things to be put on to the edge (*anto*) of the kaṭhina when it is worn thin; at *Vin.* ii. 177 they are among the " trifles " for which a disposer is to be appointed. On *paribhaṇḍa* as some kind of flooring, see *Vin.* ii. 113, 172; *Vin. Texts* iii. 85, n. 3; iii. 213, n. 6.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LIX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having assigned a robe[1] to a monk who shared his brother's cell,[2] made use of it, (the robe) not having been taken away.[3] Then that monk told this matter to the monks, saying:

"Your reverences, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having assigned a robe to me, makes use of it, (the robe) not having been taken away."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having assigned a robe to a monk, make use of it, (the robe) not having been taken away?"

. . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, yourself having assigned . . . not having been taken away?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, yourself having assigned . . . not having been taken away? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, himself having assigned a robe to a monk or to a nun or to a female probationer or to a male novice or to a female novice, should make use of it, (the robe) not having been taken away, there is an offence of expiation."[4] || 1 ||

---

[1] At *Vin.* i. 297 monks were allowed to allot robes, but not to assign them.

[2] *Cf.* above, p. 139.

[3] *apaccuddhāraka*. *Cf.* above, p. 22, n. 3.

[4] *Cf.* Pāc. LXXXI.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case. [**121**]

To a monk means: to another monk.

A nun means: one ordained by both Orders.[1]

A female probationer means: one training in the six rules[2] for two years.

A male novice means: one conforming to the ten rules of training.[3]

A female novice means: one conforming to the ten rules of training.[4]

Himself[5] means: himself[5] having assigned.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes, (including) the least one fit for assignment.[6]

Assignment means: there are two (kinds of) assignment, assignment in the presence and assignment in the absence. Assignment in the presence means that he says, 'I assign this robe to you or to so and so.' Assignment in the absence means that he says, 'I will give this robe to you for the sake of assigning (it).'[7] He should say, 'Who is your friend or intimate acquaintance?' 'So and so, and so and so,' he says. He should say, 'I will give to them; make use of what is due to them or give it away or do as you like (with it).'

(The robe) not having been taken away means: either if it is not given to him, or if not putting his trust in him, he makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. || 1 ||

If he thinks that (the robe) is not taken away when it is not taken away, (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether

---

[1] =above, pp. 32, 40.

[2] *chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhā*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 343. These rules are the five *sīlas* and one against eating at the wrong time. For this last *cf.* Pāc. XXXVII.

[3] *dasasikkhāpadika*.

[4] *dasasikkhāpadikā*. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 343.

[5] *sāmaṃ . . . sayaṃ*.

[6] *Cf.* above, pp. 40, 48, 140.

[7] Or, as at *Vin. Texts* i. 45, n. 3, 'I give this robe to you for you to appoint (to someone else).'

(the robe) is not taken away . . . If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is not taken away, (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. If he allots[1] it or gives it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that (the robe) is not taken away when it is taken away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether (the robe) is taken away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is taken away, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence either if he gives it, or if putting his trust in him, he makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Ninth

[1] *adhiṭṭheti*, see above, p. 7, n. 1.

EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) LX

. . . at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks did not store their requisites. The group of six monks hid a bowl and a robe belonging to the group of seventeen monks. The group of seventeen monks spoke thus to the group of six monks:

"Your reverences, give back [122] the bowl and the robe to us."

The group of six monks laughed; these cried out. Monks spoke thus:

"Why do you, your reverences, cry out?"

"Your reverences, this group of six monks are hiding a bowl and a robe belonging to us."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks hide a bowl and a robe belonging to monks?" . . .

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, are hiding a bowl and a robe belonging to monks?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, hide a bowl and a robe belonging to monks? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should hide or should cause to hide a monk's bowl or robe or (piece of cloth) to sit upon[1] or needle-case or girdle, even in fun, there is an offence of expiation." || **1** ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

---

[1] *nisīdana*. *Cf. Vin.* i. 295 and above, pp. 34, 87.

A monk's means: another monk's.

Bowl means: there are two (kinds of) bowls, an iron bowl and a clay bowl.[1]

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes, (including) the least one fit for assignment.[2]

(*Piece of cloth*) *to sit upon* means: it is so called if it has a border.[3]

Needle-case[4] means: it is with a needle or it is without a needle.

Girdle means: there are two (kinds of) girdles, those made of strips of cloth[5] and those . . .[6]

Should hide means: if he himself hides, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should cause to hide means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he hides much, there is an offence of expiation.

Even in fun means: desiring amusement. || 1 ||

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) hides or causes (someone) to hide a bowl . . . or a girdle, even in fun, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained . . . If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained . . . offence of expiation. If he hides or causes (someone) to hide another requisite, even in fun, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he hides or causes (someone) to hide the bowl or robe or another requisite of one who is not ordained, even in fun, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[7] If he thinks that he is ordained when

[1] =above, p. 115 (where see n. 2), and *Vin.* iv. 243. *Cf.* also the three bowls mentioned at *Vin.* iii. 169=*B.D.* i. 292, *lohapatta, sāṭakapatta, sumbhakapatta.*

[2] *Cf.* above, pp. 40, 48.

[3] *sadasa. Cf.* above, p. 87, and *Vin.* iv. 171.

[4] *Cf. Vin.* i. 301 ff., and Pāc. LXXXVI.

[5] *paṭṭika.* I follow translation at *Vin. Texts* iii. 143.

[6] *sūkarantaka. Vin. Texts* iii. 143, n. 5, " we do not venture to translate the term." See Bu.'s explanation at *Vin.* ii. 319. Both these kinds of girdles are allowed at *Vin.* ii. 136.

[7] Indicating that members of other sects were not to be inconvenienced.

he is not ordained, there is an offence [123] of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.[1] || 2 ||

There is no offence if he is not desiring fun; if he puts in order what is badly arranged[2]; if he puts it in order, thinking, 'I will give it back, having given dhamma-talk'; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || **2** ||

The Tenth

This is its key:

Fermented liquor, the finger, and water,[3] and dis-
respect, frightening,
Fire, bathing, disfigurement, himself (the robe) not
having been taken away, and about hiding.

The Sixth Division: that on drinking fermented liquor

[1] Another of these errors, noted before—should surely read *anāpatti*, no offence.
[2] *dunnikkhitta*, wrongly put down or set down.
[3] *toya*.

INDEXES

I.—WORDS AND SUBJECTS

[References to words commented upon in the Old Commentary are printed in heavy type.]

II.—NAMES

III.—SOME PALI WORDS IN THE NOTES

IV.—ABBREVIATIONS USED IN FOOTNOTES

A.=Anguttara-Nikāya.
AA.=Commentary on A.
Abh.=Abhidhānappadīpikā, by Moggallāna Thera, ed. W. Subhūti, 3rd edn., Colombo, 1900.
Ap.=Apadāna.
Asl.=Atthasālinī.
B.D.=*Book of the Discipline.*
Bu.=Buddhaghosa.
Bud. Ind.=*Buddhist India*, by T. W. Rhys Davids.
Bud. Psych. Ethics=Translation of *Dhs.*, by Mrs. Rhys Davids.
C.H.I.=*Cambridge History of India.*
C.P.D.=*Critical Pali Dictionary* (Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith).
Comy.=Commentary.
D.=Dīgha-Nikāya.
DA.=Commentary on D.
DhA.=Commentary on Dhp.
Dhp.=Dhammapada.
Dhs.=Dhammasaṅgaṇi.
Dial.=*Dialogues of the Buddha.*
D.P.P.N.=*Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (G. P. Malalasekera).
Fur. Dial.=*Further Dialogues.*
G.S.=*Gradual Sayings.*
I.H.Q.=*Indian Historical Quarterly.*
It.=Itivuttaka.
ItA.=Commentary on It.
Jā.=Jātaka.
J.As.=*Journal Asiatique.*
J.P.T.S.=*Journal of the Pali Text Society.*
J.R.A.S.=*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
KhuA.=Commentary on Khuddakapāṭha.
K.S.=*Kindred Sayings.*
Kvu.=Kathāvatthu.
M.=Majjhima-Nikāya.
MA.=Commentary on M.
Miln.=Milindapañha.
Minor Anthol.=*Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon* (*S.B.B.*).
Nd.=Niddesa.
Nissag.=Nissaggiya.
Pāc.=Pācittiya.
P.E.D.=*Pali - English Dictionary* (T. W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede).
P. Purity=*Path of Purity.*
Pss. Breth.=*Psalms of the Brethren.*
Pss. Sisters=*Psalms of the Sisters.*
Pug.=Puggalapaññatti.
PugA.=Commentary on Pug.
Pv.=Petavatthu.
PvA.=Commentary on Pv.
S.=Saṃyutta-Nikāya.
SA.=Commentary on S.
S.B.B.—*Sacred Books of the Buddhists.*
S.B.E.=*Sacred Books of the East.*
S.H.B.=*Simon Hewavitarne Bequest.*
Sn.=Suttanipāta.
SnA.=Commentary on Sn.
Thag.=Theragāthā.
Thīg.=Therīgāthā.
Ud.=Udāna.
UdA.=Commentary on Ud.
VA.=Commentary on Vin.
Vbh.=Vibhaṅga.
VbhA.=Commentary on Vbh.
Vin.=Vinaya.
Vin. Texts=*Vinaya Texts.*
Vism.=Visuddhimagga.

